



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>



8

EX. 1010 311



THE

ECCLESIASTIC.

VOLUME XXVIII.

JANUARY TO DECEMBER, MDCCCLXVI.

LONDON:

JOSEPH MASTERS, ALDERSGATE STREET,
AND NEW BOND STREET.

OXFORD: JAMES PARKER AND CO.; A. R. MOWBRAY.
CAMBRIDGE: HALL AND SON. DERBY: J. AND C. MOZLEY.

MDCCCLXVI.

LONDON :
PRINTED BY JOSEPH MASTERS AND SON,
ALDERSGATE STREET.



CONTENTS.

	PAGE
Alford's English New Testament	358
Annotated Book of Common Prayer	349
Baker (Sir S.) on the Evangelisation of Africa	445
Benedictine Monastery in the Thirteenth Century	533, 571
Blunt's View of Christian History	582
Brinckman's Answer to Keenan	92
Buckler on the Restoration of Lincoln Cathedral	421
Carter's Life of Penitence	522
Close (Dean) on Ritualism	552
Conscience Clause	463
Conversion of the Northern Nations	247
Correspondence	48, 100, 347
Daniel Examined	491
Dan John Gaytrigge, the Parish Priest of the Fourteenth Century	413
Dewes on the Authorised Version	437
Dollinger's First Ages of Christianity	311
Ecce Homo	217
Essays on Questions of the Day	290
Evangelicals and the Prayer Book	149
Female Biography	43
Few Words on the Increase of the Episcopate and the Distribution of Patronage	297, 372
Freeman's Rites and Ritual	193
Have we an Altar?	165
Hidden Depths	237
In Memoriam	243
Kay's Crisis Hupfeldiana	504
Lee and Brady on the Irish Succession	528
Livingstone's Zambesi Expedition	116
Modern Preaching	60
Mozley's Bampton Lectures	49
Neale's Posthumous Poems	433
Newman's Reply to Pusey's Eirenicon	122, 180
Oakeley (Canon) on the Eirenicon	223
Oxford: its Morals and Politics	543
Pauline Theology	27, 134, 171, 227, 270, 326
Peacock's Inventories of Church Furniture in 1566	458
Poems by Plumptre and others	516
Position of the Irish Church	382
Prophetical Office, on the	473
Rawlinson's Ancient Monarchies	70
Recent Sacred Poetry	281

	PAGE
Report of the Committee of Convocation on Ritual	321
Reviewer Reviewed	479
Robert Mannyng, the Lincolnshire Canon	199
Rolle (Richard), the Yorkshire Hermit	1, 77
Rowley's Story of the Zambesi Mission	556
Scylla and Charybdis	425
Shirley's Lecture on Scholasticism	144
Supply and Training of Candidates for Holy Orders	16, 258
Walton on the Celebrant's Position	498
Wordsworth's Commentary on the Bible	101
Wordsworth on the Book of Judges	397

INDEX OF BOOKS

REVIEWED OR NOTICED.

	PAGE		PAGE
Ackland's (T. S.) Summary of Evi- dences	296	Brinckman's (A.) Answer to Keenan	92
Alford's (H.) New Testament for English Readers	358	Buckler's (J. C.) Description and Defence of Lincoln Cathedral Restoration	421
Andrewes' (Bishop) Private Prayers	98	Butler's (Mr.) Short Meditations . .	198
Baines' (J.) Conversations on Eng- lish History	296	Calendar of the Prayer Book . . .	395
Baines' (J.) Heads for Harvest Fes- tivals	490	Campion (W. M.) on the Prayer Book	244
Baird's (W.) Sermon on the Cattle Plague	198	Capetown's (Dean of) Ordination Sermon	347
Baird's (W.) Revival of the Sub- diaconate	45	Carter's (T. T.) Life of Penitence . .	522
Baird's (W.) Mystery of Bethlehem	295	Carus' (Canon) Inspiration of Scrip- ture	347
Baker (Sir S.) on the Source of the Nile	445	Catechism of Theology	346
Barry's (Dr.) Cheltenham College Sermons	296	Chambers' (J. D.) Lights before Sacrament	321
Bartrum's (E.) Promotion by Merit	246	Chapters on Animals	97
Benson's (R. M.) Sermon on the Cattle Plague	198	Church Advocate	321
Benson's (R. M.) Divine Rule of Prayer	586	Church Builder	97
Bingham's (Mr.) Essay on the Irish Church	396	Church Doctrines proved by the Bible	393
Biographies of Good Women	43	Church Magazine	97
Blakeney's (Dr.) History of the Prayer Book	149	Church Monitor	321
Blunt's (J. H.) Annotated Book of Common Prayer	349	Churton's (Archdeacon) Power of Holy Minstrelsy	347
Blunt's (J. H.) View of Christian History	582	Clarke's Ante-Nicene Fathers . . .	98
Bosanquet's (J. W.) Messiah the Prince	491	Close (Dean) on the Catholic Re- vival	552
Brechin's (Bishop of) Meditations on the Passion	148	Cottage Commentary	98
Bright's (W.) Hymns and other Poems	46	Daniell's (J. J.) Lays of the Eng- lish Cavaliers	281
Bright's (W.) Latin Prayer Book . .	196	Dawson's (A. A.) Christian Sacrifice	294
		Dewes' (A.) Plea for a New Trans- lation of the Scriptures	437
		Dollinger's (J. I.) First Ages of Christianity	311
		Dores de Gualdim	394
		Ecce Homo	217
		Ecce Homines	516

CONTENTS.

V

	PAGE		PAGE
Ecclesiastical Year Book . . .	246	Littledale's (Dr.) Early Christian Ritual . . .	321
Echoes of our Childhood . . .	47	Littleton's Sermons on Holy Communion . . .	58
Elliott (C. J.) on the North Side of the Table . . .	488	Little Primer . . .	394
Elvy's (J. M.) Revival of Lay Orders . . .	45	Liturgy of S. Chrysostom, Greek and English . . .	539
Enraght's (R. W.) Bible Ritualism indispensable . . .	321	Livingstone's (Dr.) Zambesi and its tributaries . . .	116
Espin's (T. E.) Claims of the Church upon the University . . .	147	Lockhart's (Mr.) Review of Pusey's Eirenicon . . .	396
Essay on Sacrifice . . .	542	Lowe's (Dr.) Erasmi Colloquia . . .	347
Essays on the Irish Church . . .	382	Manual of the Te Deum . . .	47
"Every Eye shall see Him" . . .	47	Marriott's (W.) Eirenica . . .	48
Fasciculus . . .	346	Massingberd's History of the Reformation . . .	490
Five Sermons on the Sacrament of the Altar . . .	443	Medd's (P. G.) Latin Prayer Book . . .	196
Fragments from the Life of a Motherless Child . . .	47	Medd's (P. G.) Letter to Mr. G. Smith . . .	543
Freeman's (Archdeacon) Rites and Ritual . . .	193	Memoranda of Angelical Doctrine . . .	542
Gov's Church on Earth . . .	588	Merivale's (C.) Conversion of the Northern Nations . . .	247
Godwin's (E. W.) Handbook of Floral Decorations . . .	46	Michell's (W.) Churches of Asia . . .	444
Goulburn's (E. M.) Acts of the Deacons . . .	541	Michell's Our Curate's Budget . . .	586
Goulburn's Personal Religion . . .	148	Miller's (E.) Pamphlet on the School Grammar . . .	396
Grenville's (H.) Chronological Synopsis . . .	541	Milner's Tract on the Sabbath . . .	99
Grueber (Mr.) on the Mixed Chalice . . .	587	Miss Chester's Work . . .	396
Hamilton's (L. R.) Parochial Sermons . . .	587	Mousell's (Dr.) Passing Bell . . .	281
Hammond's (J.) Law and Usage of the Church . . .	146	Monthly Paper of Sunday Teaching . . .	587
Helmore's (F.) Burial Service . . .	586	Moore's (H.) Sermon on Vestments . . .	246
Helpful Sam . . .	588	Mountain's (Dr.) Erasmus on Preparation for Death . . .	246
Hessey's (Dr.) Catechisings . . .	490	Mozley's Bampton Lectures . . .	49
Hidden Depths . . .	237	Neale's (J. M.) Sequences . . .	433
Home Mission Field . . .	97	Neale's (J. M.) Stabat Mater Speciosa . . .	433
Houghton's (W.) Pauline Theology . . .	542	Net, the . . .	97
Hutchinson's (T.) Holy Thoughts and Musings . . .	296	Newman's (Dr.) Letter to Dr. Pusey . . .	122, 180
Illustrations of Scripture History . . .	394	North's (Mr.) Chronicle of S. Martin's, Leicester . . .	588
Institution and Induction . . .	148	Nugee's (G.) Fly-sheets . . .	148
Ivon . . .	395	Oakeley's (Canon) Letter to Manning . . .	223
Jebb's (Dr.) Ritual Law and Custom . . .	146, 165	Oldknow's (Dr.) Mutual Conciliation advocated . . .	321
Kay's (Dr.) Crisis Hupfeldiana . . .	504	Oldknow's (Dr.) Anti-ritual Proceedings . . .	321
Knight's (J. C.) The Law, Prophets, and Psalms . . .	441	Oswald the Young Artist . . .	46
Lea's (W.) Sermons . . .	587	Oxenham (H. N.) on Pusey's Eirenicon . . .	245
Lee's (Dr.) Strictures on Dr. Brady's Pamphlet . . .	528	Parker's (J. H.) Glossary of Architecture . . .	490
Lee's (F. G.) King's Highway . . .	281	Parrott's (M. A.) Holy Women of Old . . .	43
Letter on Eucharistic Vestments . . .	444	Peacock's (E.) English Church Furniture . . .	458
Liddell's (R.) Scripture Rationale of Vestments . . .	146	Phillips's Your Duty and Mine . . .	97
Liddon's (H. P.) University Sermons . . .	60	Pinnock's (Dr.) Law of the Rubric . . .	441
Liddon's (H. P.) Ordination Sermon . . .	542	Plow's (Mr.) Litany of the Love of God . . .	396
Littledale's (Dr.) Essay on Incense . . .	197		

	PAGE		PAGE
Plumptre's (E. H.) Master and Scholar	516	Smith's (Dr.) Sermon on the Cattle Plague	198
Position and Prospects of Curates	347	Smith's (G.) Letter to Rev. C. W. Sandford	543
Present Position of Curates	246	S. David's (Bishop of) Charge	587
Prest's (Archdeacon) Charge	99	Stanley's (Dean) Sermon for the Bishop of London's Fund	490
Prynne's (G. R.) We have an Altar	321	Stanley's (Dean) Sermon on Westminster Abbey	98
Psalter and Canticles Pointed	540	Stevens (Mr.) on Infant and Adult Baptism	443
Purchas' (J.) Death of Ezekiel's wife	347	Stone's Lyra Fidelium	99
Pye's (H. J.) Audi Alteram Partem	321	Sunday Morning in Leather Lane	347
Rawlinson's (G.) Five Great Monarchies	70	Sutton's Godly Meditations	444
Reasons why all should remain in Church during Holy Communion	588	Tales for the Church Seasons	588
Recent Movements in the Church of England	479	Tekel	425
"Rend your heart," &c.	148	"The Word was made Flesh"	47
Report of the Committee of Convocation on Ritual	321	Thinking for Oneself	48
Report of Bristol Church Congress	60	Thompson's (H.) The Sunday School	396
Report of S. George's Mission	198	Thoughts on Religion and the Bible	425
Richard's (W. U.) Sermon on Eucharistic Adoration	396	Tremenheere's (H. S.) Translations from Pindar	346
Ridley's Everyday Companion	99, 443	Trevor (Canon) Story of the Cross	296
River Reeds	516	Trust	444
Rowley's (H.) Story of the Zambesi Mission	556	Verses for the Blind and Afflicted	281
S. Augustine the fruit of a Mother's prayer	148	Walker's (C.) Sarum Liturgy	296, 347
Selections New and Old	490	Walton's (H. B.) Rubrical Determination of the Celebrant's Position	498
Sharpe's (S.) Notes on the Authorised Version	585	Winter in the East	444
Shipley's Lyra Messianica	97	Wix (S.) Reflections on the Expediency of a Council	143
Shipley's Readings for Ascension and Whitsuntide	99	Wordsworth's (Dr.) Commentary on the Bible	101, 397
Shipley's Church and the World	290, 586	Wordsworth's (Dr.) Essay on the Irish Church	396
Shipley's Liturgies of 1549 and 1662	396	Wordsworth (Dr.) on Union with Rome	396
Shirley's (Dr.) Lecture on Scholasticism	144	Wortham's (B. H.) Offertory Sentences	587
Smith's (S.) Altar and the Cross	542		

THE ECCLESIASTIC.

RICHARD ROLLE, THE YORKSHIRE HERMIT OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

THE life of the Eremit was the earliest form assumed by that devout spirit, which desired to dedicate all to God, and to relinquish the world utterly. So popular did this way of life become, that it was the very superabundance of hermits in Egypt which naturally and necessarily led to the Cœnobitic life. The climate of the East, the physical character of some eastern countries, as of Palestine and Egypt, the natural bent of the people which is rather contemplative than active, were all predisposing causes to the abundant development of the eremitic life; but, whether this form of devotion ever extensively prevailed in the West, is open to question. Instances will, doubtless, be found here and there, but the severity of western climates, and the more cultivated and peopled character of western lands forbid us to think that the profession of the hermit, in its true strictness, was a common one. At any rate English hermits, that we can identify, are not of frequent occurrence, and the notion of a solitary living in a cave in Yorkshire, is a very different one from that which is suggested by the Eremit reclining under the cool shade of a rock in the deserts of Egypt. It is true that in the Vision of Piers Plowman we have a crowd of Eremites spoken of, but these were of that sort who—

“Clothed them in copis to be knowe fro othire,
And made themsilve eremites thure eise to have.”

The subject of this article is universally known by the name of Richard the Hermit; yet we do not find that he lived in a cave, (as the popular notion of a hermit seems to suggest,) but spent the first part of his life in a *casella*, as it is called in the Legend of his life, and afterwards resided in or near the Cistercian convent of Hampole. Inasmuch, however, as he did

not submit himself to the *rule* of any of the great monasteries, nor, as far as is known, take any degree of holy orders, but entered on the life of religious contemplation in as retired and private a manner as it was possible for him to accomplish, he is properly described as a hermit. The other designation by which he is commonly known, Richard de Hampole, is not so correct. He was in no sense properly *de Hampole*, save that his death and burial took place there. He had a distinct patronymic of his own, and his birthplace was far away from Hampole. The origin of the name however is easy enough to account for. The Priory of Hampole possessed the body of the saint, and as his was the most famous miracle-working shrine in the neighbourhood, the closeness of the connection between Richard and the religious house was magnified, until at last he became Richard of Hampole, as though all his life had been spent there. But what of this hermit, and what the importance of his proper designation? We desire to introduce him to our readers as one of the most copious, most vigorous, and most striking writers of the fourteenth century, and as such it is well in the first place to settle about his right name.

A sort of Life of the hermit, written in Latin, still exists in a rare MS., and from this we learn that he was the son of William Rolle, of Thornton, in the county of York. The name of his birthplace is a common one in Yorkshire, but from other evidence supplied by the Life, we are led to conjecture, that this place was Thornton-le-Street, near Thirsk, in Richmondshire. The father of Richard was probably a substantial yeoman, as he sent his son at an early age to a good school. As the youth grew up he attracted the notice of Master Thomas de Neville, Archdeacon of *Durham*. We believe that the parish of Thornton-le-Street is or was a Durham peculiar; and, if so, the fact of the Archdeacon of Durham having been the patron of young Rolle, would strongly confirm the locality selected. Master Neville sent him at his proper charge to the University of Oxford, where Richard made great advances; but despising secular learning as compared with theological, and desiring to devote himself entirely to sacred pursuits, he finally left Oxford in his nineteenth year, and returned to his father's house. He had already conceived the idea of living as a solitary; and in order to provide himself with a dress suitable for a hermit he applied to his sister, whom he tenderly loved, for the gift of two garments from her wardrobe, and that she would also secure for him a hood which was sometimes worn by their father. She could not understand the purpose of this strange request, but, nevertheless, she yielded to it, and did as her brother desired. Richard repairing secretly to the wood, and finding the garments, proceeded to construct for himself a costume from them. He cut off the wide hanging sleeves of one of the robes and made it fit close to the arm, and with the sleeves he made a covering for the neck and

chest. With this as his only garment, and his head protected by the patèrnal hood, he seemed to himself to have constructed a fair outside resemblance of a hermit; at any rate the effect was striking on his sister herself, who seeing her brother thus transformed shouted out with terror, "He is mad, he is mad." These words alarmed Richard, and in dread lest his friends should put him under restraint, he fled to a more distant solitude; there, says his biographer, entering "the celestial ranks." But he was not allowed to remain long unnoticed. On the vigil of the Assumption, desiring to worship the Blessed Virgin, he entered a church, and kneeled down to make his devotions in the exact spot where the lady of a certain honourable knight, by name Sir John de Dalton¹ used to pray. As the hermit was kneeling the lady entered to hear vespers, and her attendants were about to remove at once the intruder; but the lady prevented them, marking his devotion, and being of a mind truly humble. When vespers were ended, and Richard had risen from prayer, the sons of Lady Dalton recognised Richard Rolle, whom they had known at Oxford, and told their mother who it was that had usurped her place. The next day, being the festival of the Assumption, Richard again entered the church, and moved by a Divine impulse he assumed the dress of an acolyte, and assisted at the celebration of mass. At the reading of the Gospel he approached the officiating priest, and craving his benediction, ascended the pulpit, and made a sermon to the people of wonderful edification. The congregation was dissolved in tears, and declared that so moving a discourse had never before been heard. After service Sir John de Dalton invited the preacher to an entertainment in the manor-house. Much against his will the young hermit was compelled to enter the hall, and was placed by the knight in the post of honour. Endeavouring to escape before the conclusion of the banquet, he was detained by his host, who, after having had much private discourse with him, and satisfied himself of his "sanity," provided him with a dress more fitting a hermit than the garment adapted from his sister's wardrobe, and also assigned him a dwelling where he might live alone, and where he should be supplied with a sufficient allowance of food to maintain him.² Here he was desired, unembarrassed by the cares of the world, to devote his time to holy contemplation—

"Al for the love of oure LORDE lyvend ful harde,
In hope to have a gode ende and hevene ryche blysse."³

The mighty advances which he made in the kindling and burning love of God, says his biographer, and the mysteries to which he

¹ It appears that there are more than one place called *Dalton*, in the neighbourhood of Thornton-le-Street.

² We find from another passage that this was a *casella*, a long distance from the manor-house. Nevertheless this was a very modified form of the Eremite life.

³ Piers Plowman.

was admitted, he, like Paul the Apostle, hath set forth in his first book "*De Incendio Amoris*." In this book he declares that he became conscious of an actual physical heat and burning. At first he believed that the cause was bodily, but he soon discovered that it was not so, that it was an inward spiritual power, making itself felt on the body by its excessive strength. He experienced sensations of inconceivable pleasure, and was kindled to such a love to God that his whole being seemed to be dissolved in it, and the more he mortified the flesh by fast and vigil the greater was his spiritual joy. His bed was the hard bench, and his food pulse and water; but he seemed to enjoy heavenly dainties, and in the multitude of his visions to be continually carried beyond the earth.

It was on this last claim that the great influence of the hermit without doubt was mainly based. Like the more modern mystics of France and Germany, he constantly declared that through love the soul could reach an actual union with God: for himself he claimed to be *extaticus*, to have been carried out of the body, and to have heard unspeakable words. In his "*Office*" it is said, "*Mortalis rapitur factus extaticus in cœlos*," and in one of the hymns—

"Dum devota meditatur rapitur in nubilum."

Such claims, backed by an ascetic life, have always been a powerful source of influence. Some indeed may have doubted the hermit's sanity, as Sir John de Dalton appears to have done. In the beginning of the book "*De Amore Dei*," he complains of detractors, who because he is always intent on singing of the love of God, declare him to be mad. But these sceptics would be rare. The claims of the *extatic* would in those days be for the most part freely allowed. If as an unordained youth he was permitted to address a sermon to the people from the pulpit, simply on the ground of the inward impulse which he felt, much more, as he afterwards achieved the reputation of an anchorite, would his mystical powers be accepted. To follow the Latin Life (which, if its details cannot be relied on, nevertheless makes out somewhat of a personality for the hermit according very well with his writings which remain) we find that the fame of his heavenly raptures, his visions and revelations, the account of his ascetic maceration of the flesh, attracted many to his cell for instruction and advice. "Great numbers did he convert to God by his exhortations and his honeyed writings, his treatises and his books written for the edification of his neighbours." Very astonishing powers of employing his time he is said to have shown. He could exhort with the greatest earnestness and profit by the hour together, while at the same time he would be unceasingly occupied in writing on a totally different subject. So great

was his abstraction from bodily things, that once when he was praying his friends drew away from him his tattered garment, and having mended and renewed it, restored it again to him and put it on him without his discovering that it had been removed.

For a considerable time, it would seem, Richard the hermit lived on the estate of his friend and patron, Sir John de Dalton; but afterwards he thought it more expedient to go from place to place, that more people might be influenced by his exhortations and example. His biographer thinks it necessary to apologise for this, as some had imputed it to him as done out of levity, and not in the true spirit of a hermit.¹ But holy Church, we are told, recognizes certain cases in which it is expedient for hermits to shift their abodes. Richard would seem to have gone throughout the county of Richmond, and at Anderby, or Ainderby, to have come just in time to render an essential service to one to whom he had long been joined in bands of spiritual love, his "ghostly suster in Jhū CHRIST," Dame Margaret Kirkby. To this lady he had addressed the "vii partie of a boke maad of Rychard Hampole heremyte to an ankeresse." In her cell at Anderby she was now tortured by a strange disease, which at once yielded to the powerful presence of the saint.

The "Legend of his Life" now gives us other accounts of his contests with devils, in which it is said he was particularly skilful. It would seem however that ere long, Richard Rolle left the northern part of the county and the neighbourhood of his birth-place, and migrated southwards, finally taking up his abode at Hampole, about five miles from Doncaster. What attracted the hermit to Hampole we can only conjecture. Here was a Cistercian nunnery, founded by William de Clairefai, in the year 1170, for fourteen or fifteen nuns.² Whether these religious ladies solicited the presence of the famous hermit that they might receive Divine instruction, or from whatever cause, Richard Rolle went to Hampole, and there he died and was buried. He had promised Dame Margaret, his "ghostly sister," that she should never have a return of her disease so long as he lived; when therefore she felt it return upon her she knew that the saint must have expired. A hasty messenger was despatched to the distant Hampole, who returned with the intelligence that Richard had died at the very moment when Margaret first felt the return of her malady. Afterwards

¹ Indeed, in the *Visions of Piers Plowman*, we find the *laslyty* of the hermits very severely commented on. "In abit as an ermite, unholy of werkis, that wente furthe in the worle wondres to hure and sawe many cellis." But Richard Rolle aspired to be one of those "ancres and ermites that holden them in their cellys—Coveytynge nocht in contries to carien about—For no lykerouse lyfode thure lykame to plesse."

² The last prioress was Isabella Arthington, who had been elected in 1518, and who surrendered the house on the 10th November, 31 Henry VIII., upon which she had a pension of £10 per annum. At the Dissolution the gross annual value of the Hampole priory was £83. 6s. 11d.—Lawton's Religious Houses of Yorkshire.

the faithful friend went to Hampole to assist at the burial of the holy saint.

We need not concern ourselves with the long list of miracles wrought at the tomb of the saint which follow his "Office" and the "Legend of his Life." The whole manuscript was evidently produced at the Hampole convent, and it is pretty clear what object it had in view. *Piers Plowman* is very severe on this sort of literature :

"In menyng¹ of miracles muche wex² hongeth there.
 Al the worlde wot wel it myghte nat be trywe.
 Ac for it profiteth you to porsewarde the prelates soffren,
 That lewede men in mysbylyve lyven and deien."³

From another source, however, we learn that at this same nunnery authentic copies of Richard the hermit's works were preserved. In the very curious rhyming Preface to his Exposition of the Psalms (in prose) we have it said :

"But for the Psalms ben full darke in many a place who wol take hede,
 And the sentence⁴ is full merke [*illegible*] who so wol rede,
 It needeth exposicyon written wel with [cunning] honde,
 To stirre toward devocyon and hit the better understonde ;
 Therefore a worthy holy man, called Rychard Hampole,
 Whom the LORD that all can leryd lely on His scole,⁵
 Glozed the sauter that sues⁶ here in English tong sykerly,
 At a worthy recluse prayer call'd Dame Marget Kyrkby.
 This same sauter in all degre is the self in sothness,
 That lyzt at Hampole [] at Richard own berynes [house]⁷
 That he wrote with his hondes to Dame Margaret Kyrkby.
 And there it lyzt in *cheyn bondes* in the same nonery ;
 In York shyr this nonery ys, who so desires it to know,
 Hyn ther way to [] thes ben places all on row,
 Hampole the nonry hyzt between [] and Pomfret,
 This is the way to mannys sight even streyght without deseyt."⁸

The reason why the original of the Psalter Exposition was preserved with so much care is presently given to us :

"Copyed has this sauter been of *yvel men of Lollardy*,
 Bot afterwarde it has bene in with eresy
 They feyden thers to leude soles that [it] shuld be all enter⁹
 A blessyd boke of their scoles of Rychard Hampole the sauter."

As the heretics had so grievously abused the Psalter of the holy hermit, a strong injunction is added to the reader :

¹ Telling. ² Profit. ³ P. P. Pass. i.
⁴ Meaning. ⁵ Taught well in His school. ⁶ Follows.
⁷ The house of Richard's berynes, or children, is probably the nunnery.
⁸ The MS. of this Preface, which is much defaced, is in the Bodleian. (Laud. 286.)
⁹ Entire, perfect.

"Whoso wol it write I rede hym wryte on warly¹ lyne be lyne
And make no more then hyf is dyith² or ellys I rede hit he ryne."³

Certainly the charge was not unnecessary. Whether from "Lollardry" or from whatever cause, Hampole's English has been strangely rewritten and altered, and indeed this very Exposition of the Psalms, which is thus prefaced, is a specimen of transmutation of the Northumbrian into a more southern form.⁴ Could we see the original copy once kept in *cheyn bondes* at the Hampole nunnery, we should doubtless see the words in a very different dress. Before we proceed to give specimens of what we conceive to have been the hermit of Hampole's genuine English, we will furnish an example of this transmutation which may suffice to illustrate the point. Among the manuscripts in the Bodleian attributed to Hampole, there is one which is styled "A Tretyse of Gostly Batayle."⁵ The style of this treatise is sufficiently archaic, and to those unacquainted with the peculiarities of the northern English it might easily pass for a writing of the age of Hampole, and be regarded as genuine. It so happens, however, that in the very same collection of which this MS. forms a part, there is another small MS.⁶ of a considerably older date, which contains two short treatises said to be by Hampole, namely, "The Rule of Mannis Body," and "The Thre Arrows in the Dome." On a comparison of these with "The Gostly Batayle," the latter treatise, which is much longer, will be seen at once to have been written from the shorter and earlier ones, sometimes following them closely, at others inserting new matter. A short specimen will suffice:

The Thre Arrows in the Dome
(Hampole.)

"Thanne forsoth the wreched dampned soule schal come to the bodi and saie to it, Rise, thou cursid caitif careyne, for nois⁷ fro this tyme forthe into with-uten ende. Thou shalt be felawed to ugli devils, enemies of Almyghty God. Now, wrech, al thi worldli joie schal be turned into woo, thi delite in to bitternesse, and thi laughter in to wepyng."

The Gostly Batayle (Adaptation.)

"Thane the dampnable soule shall come to the body and say to hit, Aryse, thou cursed caytyf, from thys tyme forwarde to be felawe with the horryble feendys in hell, and enemy to Almyghty God. Now thy joye shal be turned into woo, thy delyte into bytternesse, and thy laughyng into wepyng."

¹ Warily.

² Query, dyght = put, inserted.

³ Run from = avoid.

⁴ "For men of the est with them of the west is, as it were, under the same partie of Hevene [and] acordeth more in sowning of speche than thei of the north with men of the south. All the longage of the Northumbers, and speccalleche at Yorke, is soe scharp, slittyng, and frotyng and unschape, that we southerne men may that langage unnethe understonde."—Hygden, Polychronicon.

⁵ MSS. Douce, 322.

⁶ MSS. Douce, 13.

⁷ Misery, torment.

So various indeed are the styles of English attributed to Richard Rolle, that one might very easily be tempted to doubt whether he indeed wrote any English. Could it have been that all his compositions were originally in Latin, and that these have been translated by hands more or less ancient and of different localities, thus producing the different styles in which they now appear? We are however, distinctly assured in the rhyming preface quoted above, not only that he wrote an Exposition of the Psalms in the English tongue, but also that he composed both for the learned and unlearned, and in his "Englyschyng" endeavoured to make it "compendious, short, good and profitabul to mannys soule."¹ There is good reason to suppose that he wrote many of his treatises both in Latin and in English, as for instance the meditation on the Name of Jesus, the original English of which is in the library of Lincoln Cathedral, while the Latin may be found both in the Harleian collection and at Cambridge. The same is also the case with the treatise "Mirroure of Synners" (*speculum peccatoris*.) The book of "The Craft of Dying" (*ars moriendi*), exists in both languages, but the English version is not Northumbrian, and was probably a translation of Hampole's Latin by another hand. It may be as well to note (especially as it is said that a complete edition of Wicliffe's works is about to be attempted,) that Wicliffe is often attributed to Hampole and *vice versa*. The little treatise called "The Charter of Hevene," which is probably by Wicliffe, is to be found among Hampole's genuine writings, and is often attributed to him. The specimens of Hampole which are now about to be quoted, are nearly all of them taken from a MS. in Lincoln Cathedral library, written by Robert de Thornton, Archdeacon of Bedford, in the fifteenth century. It has been stated above that a Thornton was Richard Rolle's native place; the Archdeacon therefore may have had a special reason for taking an interest in the works of so famous a man, as his birthplace may have been that from which his own family drew their name. He himself was born at East Newton or Oswaldkirk, near Helmsley, in the North Riding, and, though he migrated southwards in after days, yet he retained, doubtless, like all north-countrymen, a strong predilection for his own land, and was therefore both likely and able to select with care and accuracy genuine specimens of Hampole's writings. It is *primâ facie* improbable that any English should have been written out in the hand of the Yorkshire Archdeacon as the composition of the Yorkshire hermit of the previous century that was not truly his; and it is very observable that out of the eleven pieces copied by

¹ In the Prick of Conscience (line 336) we have it told us,

"Tharfore this buk es on ynglese drawn
Of sere matters that er unknowen,
Til laude men that er unkunnand
That can na latyn understand."

Thornton, and ascribed by name to "Richard, hermit," only three are in Latin, the remainder being in English prose. These treatises also have all the dialectical peculiarities now acknowledged to belong to the Northumbrian dialect, that nervous form of old English which with slight modifications prevailed over the Lowlands of Scotland, as well as the district between the Tweed and the Humber. Assuredly such ancient specimens of religious thought, clothed in the genuine racy tongue of the Anglo-Saxon, and being almost the oldest English prose to be found which is intelligible without a copious glossary, cannot be without interest to any who love to look back to the days of old—to realize as far as may be the ancient state of the land, with its thinly-scattered "manors" and "castles," with the poor hamlet clustering round them, its churches even then solid and beautiful—or to think of the people in their simple faith, their profound reverence for claims of sanctity, their readiness to believe in visions and revelations, and to follow with awe-struck deference the bidding of the "holy hermit" who came forth from his cell like the prophet of old to command veneration by his austerity.

Perhaps the most singular fact connected with the Hermit of Hampole is the immense number of manuscripts of his writings which still exist. In English prose and English verse, in Latin prose and Latin verse, they crowd the archives of our great libraries. Not a collection at the Bodleian but has great store of Rolle's compositions. Scarce a college in Oxford but has some of them. There are probably over a hundred at Cambridge. The Harleian collection has a great mass of them. They are to be found in many of our cathedral libraries, and even in the village libraries of old date, which are scattered abroad over the country.¹ It was from one of these latter that the late H. J. Rose published some English prayers of Richard Rolle's in the "British Magazine" about thirty years ago.² The "Prick of Conscience," a long English poem attributed to the hermit, has been published by the Philological Society, and though Warton in noticing it in his History of Poetry prophesies that he shall be the last who will make extracts from it, so far was he wrong that in these latter days it has found an able and laborious editor in Mr. Morris, and has been read by many both on account of its quaint English and its singular theology. But we take leave to say that those who know Richard Rolle's English only through his poetry do not at all know it in its power. His really vigorous English is prose. And of this scarce any has been printed. An old collection of his "Contemplacions" was printed by Wynkyn

¹ See for an account of R. de Hampole's MSS., Bp. Tanner, *Not. Script.*, s.v. Hampole.

² Sept., 1833. These prayers are not in the genuine Northumbrian of Richard Rolle, but have been altered by a southern scribe.

de Worde, and some extracts from his MSS. may have been quoted in modern days, but to the great majority of readers Richard Rolle is entirely unknown as a writer of English prose.

The first passage which we shall present to the reader is taken from the *Meditations on the Holy Name of JESUS*. It has been already said that this treatise exists in Latin as well as in English, but there is every reason to suppose that the English version here quoted is a genuine production of the hermit.

“Of the vertuz of the haly name of Jhū Ricardus Heremita super v'siclo
'Oleum effusum nomen tuum.' (Cantic. i. 3.)¹

“A! A! that wonderfull name! A! that delitabyll name! This es the name that es abown alle names; name althirhegeste² with-owtten whilke na man hopes hele.³ This name es in myn ere hevenly sowne—in my mouth honyfull swetnes.—Therefore na wondyr thofe I lufe that name, the whylke gyffes comforthe to me in all angwys. I can noghte praye, I cane noghte hafe mynde⁴ bot sownnande the nam of Jhū. I savoure noghte joye that with Jhū es noghte mengede.⁵ Whare-so I be, whare-so I sytt, what-so I doo, the mynd⁶ of the savoure of the name Jhū departis noghte fra my mynde. I haff sett my mynde—I haff sett it als ta kynnyng⁷ appone myn arm for luf es strange als dede.⁸ Als ded slaas alle swa luf overcomes alle—ay-lastande luf has overcomyne me, noghte for to sla me, but for to qwykkkyne me. Bot it has woundyde me ffor it sulde leche⁹ me. It has thurghefychede¹⁰ my herte, that merghely,¹¹ ere it be helyde. And now overcomen I fayle, unnethes¹² I lyfe for joye. Nerehand I dye for I suffyce noghte in delycyoneste swettnes and ay to be dronkenede. It falles¹³ the flesche may noghte of his vertu noghte defaile¹⁴ ay whils the saule in swylk joyes es ravyste for to joye. But whence unto me swylke joye bot for Jhū? The nam of Jhū has taughte me for to synge and has lyghtenede my mynde with the hete of unmade lyghte. Therefore I syghe and crye, wha sall schewe to the lufede Jhū that I langwys for lufe? My flesche has faylede me and my herte meltes in lufe zarenande¹⁵ Jhū. Alle the herte festenede in the zernynge¹⁶ of Jhū is turned in-to the fyre of lufe and with the swettnes of the Godhede fullily is fillide. Therefore a! gude Jhū hafe mercy of this wrethe,¹⁷ schewe Thee to this languessande, be Thou leche unto this wondyde. If Thou come I am hale. I fele me noghte seke for langwyssande for Thi lufe. Late my saule takande seekande Thee Jhū, whaym it lufes, with whas lufe it is takyne, whaym anely it covaytes. Sothely the mynd [es] towchede

¹ From R. Thornton's MS., Linc. Cath. Library. Date of MS., 1440.

² Highest of all (Phil. ii. 9.)

⁴ Meditate.

⁶ Remembrance.

⁸ Strong as death.

¹⁰ Pierced through.

¹² Hardly, scarcely.

¹⁴ Fail, fall short of.

¹⁶ Desiring, longing for.

³ Salvation.

⁵ Mingled.

⁷ Like the seal, v. Cantic. viii. 6.

⁹ Heal.

¹¹ Through the marrow.

¹³ Happens.

¹⁵ Concerning, as regards.

¹⁷ Sorrow.

with the soverayne swettnes and es for to waxe hate in the lufe of the Makare, and whyls¹ it enforthis for to halde besyly in it the swetteste name of Jhū. Sothely fra thythen² inryses a gret lufe and what thyng that it trewely touchis it ravesche it uttirly to it. It inflawmes the affeccyone, it hyndis the thoghte, za and alle the name³ it drawes to the swetnes of it. Sothely Jhū, desederabyll es Thi name, lufabyll and comfortabyll. Nane swa swete joye may be consayevede. Nane swa swete sange may be herde. Nane swa swete and delytabyll solace may be hade in mynde. Tharefore whatsoever thou be that redies the⁴ for to lufe GODE, if thou wilt nowthire be dyssayvede, ne dyssave, if thou wille be wysse and noghte unwysse, if thou wilt stand and noghte falle, have in mynde besely for to halde the name of Jhū in thi mynde, and thane thyne enemy salle falle and thou salle stande, thyne enemy salle be made wayke, thou salle be made strange, and if thou wilt lelely do this ferre⁵ fra drede thou salle be glorious and lowvabyll overcomere. Seke therfore the name of Jhū and halde it and forgette it noghte. Sothely na thyng slokyns sa felle flawmes, destroys ille thoghtes, puttes owt venemous affeccyons, dos away curyous and vayne occupacyons fra us. This name Jhū lelely haldyne in mynde drawes by the rote⁶ vyces, settys vertus, inlawes⁷ charytee, in-zettes⁸ savoure of heavenly thynges, wastys discorde, reformes pese, gyffes in-lastande ryste, dose away grevesnes of fleschely desyris, turnis alle erthely thyng to noye,⁹ fylls the luffande of gastely joye; so that wele it may be saide, 'At gloriabatur¹⁰ omnes qui diligunt nomen Tuum, quoniam Tu benedices justo,' that es, 'Alle salle joye that lufes Thi name, for Thou salle blysse the ryghtwyse.' . . . Sothely thay salle joye be in-zettyng of grace and in tyme to come be syghte of joye, and therefore¹¹ salle thay joye, for why joyes come of lufe, tharefore he that lufes noghte he salle ever more be withowtyn joye. Tharefore many wreches of the worlde trowande tham to joye with CHRIST salle sorowe with-owtten ende. And why? for thay lufede noghte the name of Jhū. That so ye doo¹² if ye gyfe all that ye hafe unto the nedy bot¹³ ye lufe the name of Jhū ye travelle in vayne. All-anely thay may joye in Jhū that lufes Hym in this lyfe and thay that fyles¹⁴ tham with vices and venemous delittes na drede that ne thay ere¹⁵ putt owte of joye—also with alle that the name of Jhū es helefulle fruytfulle and glorious, tharefore wha sall have hele that lufes it noghte and wha sall bere the frwyte before CHRIST that has noghte the floure? And joye salle he noghte see that joyeande luffede noghte the name of Jhū. The wykkyde salle be don awaye that he see noghte the joye of GOD. Sothely the ryghtwyse sekys the joye and the lufe and thay fynd it in Jhū whaym thay luffede. I zede¹⁶ abowte be covaytise of reches and I fande noghte Jhū. I rane the wantonness of flesche and I fande noghte Jhū. I satt in companyes of worldly myrth and I fande noghte Jhū. In all thire I soghte Jhū

¹ Qy. ay whyls.

³ Qy. mane = man.

⁵ Far.

⁷ Forms within.

⁹ Sorrow.

¹¹ For this cause.

¹³ Except.

¹⁵ No fear but that they are.

² From thence.

⁴ Preparest thyself.

⁶ Draws up by the root.

⁸ Pours in.

¹⁰ Gloriabuntur, Ps. ix. 10.

¹² Ye do thus.

¹⁴ Defile.

¹⁶ Went.

bot I fande Hym noghte, for He let me wyte¹ by His grace, that He ne es foundene in the lande of softly lyfande. Therefore I turnide by anothire waye, and I rane abowte be poverté and I fande Jhū pure borne in the worlde, laid in a crybe, and lappid in clathis. I zode² by sufferynge of werynes and I fand Jhū wery in the way, turment³ with hungyre, thriste and calde, fild with repreves and blames. I satt by myne ane⁴ fleecande the vanytes of the worlde and I fande Jhū in deserte, fastande in the mount, anely⁵ prayande. I rane by the payne of penaunce and I fand Jhū bownden, scourgede, gyffene galle to drynke, naylyde to the crosse, hyngand in the crosse and dyeand in the crosse. Tharefore Jhū es noghte fundene in riches bot in poverté, noghte in delytes, bot in penaunce, noghte in wanton joyeynge bot in bitter gretynge,⁶ noghte emange many, bot in anelynes. . . . Sothely I have na wondyr if the tempted falle that puttes noghte the name of Jhū in lastande mynde. Sekerly may he or scho⁷ chese⁸ to lyfe anely that has chosen the nam of Jhū to thaire specyalle, for thare may na wykkid spyritte noye thare⁹ Jhū es mekylle in mynde or es nennende¹⁰ in mouthe."

It is unnecessary, we believe, to apologize for the length of this extract. The nervous simplicity of the style, the terse vigour of the old Anglo-Saxon words and the deep devotional spirit which it exhibits must commend it to the reader. What would we not give to hear a sermon delivered now in this grand old diction instead of having to listen to the vapid and inflated bombast of the Johnsonian school! Neither, as regards the matter of the extract is there any need of apology. It is clear that the hermit regarded with a special and intense reverence the holy Name, but that he did not look upon it with an ignorant superstition, another short extract from his writings will show.

"Also sum mane is dyssayvede on this wyse. He heris wele say that it es gude to have Jhū in his mynde, and any other gude worde of GODD, and than he streynes his herte myghtyly to that name and by acustome he hase it nerehande alway in his mynde. Noghte for-thi he felis nouth¹¹ thare-by in his affeccyone swetnes, ne lighte of knowynge in his resoun, bot anely a nakede mynde of GODD or of Jhū, or of Mary, or any other gude worde. Here may be discayte, for it es ille to hafe Jhū in mynde one this wyse. For wite thou wele that a nakede mynde or a nakede ymagycione of Jhū, or of any gastely thyng withouten swetnes of lufe in the affeccyone, or with-owtten lyghte of knowynge in resoun es bot a blyndnes and a waye to dessayte."

This hermit was not a mere counter of beads, or one who estimated the value of his prayers by the number of repetitions. He had a deep insight into spiritual religion and was strongly opposed

¹ Wit = know.

³ Tormented.

⁵ Alone, v. S. Luke vi. 12.

⁷ She.

⁹ Where.

¹¹ Not for that he feels either.

² Another form of zede.

⁴ By myself.

⁶ Weeping.

⁸ Direct his course.

¹⁰ Taken.

to the *opus operatum* view, which doubtless, was the popular view of his time, as it unfortunately is of ours. We are enabled to illustrate this very strikingly by means of two short stories which Archdeacon Thornton gives us in the Lincoln Manuscript as from Richard Hermite, and which, there is every reason to think, are in the hermit's own words.

"Rycharde hermyte reherces a dredfulle tale of unperfyte contrycyone that a haly man Cesarius tellys in ensample. He says: a yonge mane a chanoine of Parys unchastely and delycously lyfande and fulle of many synnys laye seke to the dede.¹ He schrafe² hym of his gret synnys, he hyghte³ to amende hym. He rescheyvede the Sacrament of the Autire, and anoynte hym, and swa he dyede. Eftyre a faa days he apperyde till ane that was famyliare till hym in hys lyfe, and said that he was dampnede for this enchesone.⁴ Thofe I warre, quod he, schriuen and hyghte to doo penaunce me wauntede verray contrycyone withowttene the whylke all othire thynges avayles noghte. For-thy if I hyghte to lefe my foly, my concyens sayde that if I lefede tham yet wolde I hafe delyte in myne alde lyfe. And till that my herte heldede mare and bowghede than to restryne me fra all thoghtes that I knewe agaynes GODE's wille. And for-thy I had na stabylle purpos in gude na perfitte contrycyone, tharefore sentence of dampnacyone ffelle on me and wente agaynes me." [All-swa he reherces anothyre tale of verray contrecyone that the same clerke Cesarius tellys.] "A scholere at Paris had done many fulle⁵ synnys, the whylke he had schame to schryfe hym of. As the last gret sorowe of herte overcame his schame, and whene he was redy to schryfe hym till the priore of the Abbay of Saynte Victor swa mekill contrycyone was in his herte syghynge in his breste, sobbynge in his throtte that he moghte noghte brynge a worde furthe. Thane the prioure said till hym, 'Gaa and wrytte thy synnes.' He did swa and come agayne to the prioure and gaf hym that he hadde wretyne, ffor zitt⁶ he myghte noghte schryfe hym with mouthe. The prioure saghe the synnys swa grette that thurghe leve of the scolere be schewede theyme to the Abbotte to hafe conceyle. The Abbotte take that bylle that thay warre wretyne in and lukede thare-one. He fand na thyng wretyne and said to the prioure, What may here be redde thare noghte es wretyn? That sagh the prioure and wondyrde gretly and saide, Wyet ye that his synns here warre wretyne, and I redde thayme, bot now I see that GOD has sene hys contrycione and forgyfes hym alle his synnes. This the Abbot and the Prioure told the scolere, and he with gret joye thanked GOD."

Another short extract, taken from a different source, will also illustrate the same view of Richard Rolle's mind. His treatise made to Dame Margaret Kirkby, the "Ankeresse," at Anderby or Ainderby, in Richmondshire, has been before alluded to. Nearly at the beginning of it⁷ we have him saying—

¹ Sick to death.

² Shrived.

³ Promised.

⁴ Reason.

⁵ Foul.

⁶ Yet.

⁷ MS. in Bodleian Library (Laud, 602.)

"Wyte thou wel a bodili turnyng to God, without thyne hert folwyng is but a figure and a lykenesse of vertuce and of ne sothfastnesse. Whar-for a wreched man or woman is thylke that leeveth al the ynward keypynges of hym-sylf and chareth¹ him with-out forth only a fourme and a lykenesse of holynesse in habyte other² clothyng, in speche and in bodili werke, by-hooldyng other mennys dedys, and demyng³ there defautys, wenyng hym-selfe to be ougt whanne he is rigt nougt,⁴ and so begylez hym-self. Do thou not so, but turne thyn harte with thy body principalli to God and shape thee withynne in His lykenesse by mekenesse and charite and other gostly vertues and thane art thou trewly turnyd to Hym."

It will not escape the student of old English, that in this latter extract some of the characteristics of genuine Northumbrian are wanting. It is, in fact, one of the many instances in which the original compositions of the Hermit have been retouched by the transcribers, though in this case without any very great and marked alterations, many of the Northern forms being still preserved. We will, however, conclude our extracts with one in which the terse old form of northern speech is well and strikingly illustrated, and which also illustrates what is perhaps the most interesting part of the hermit's compositions, namely, the instruction which he gave to the "unlered folk," who pressed to hear him. It is an Exposition of the Ten Commandments, sinking, as will at once be perceived, the second. At what date this practice first began we are unable to say; this is probably rather an early example of it.

*"A notabille Tretys of the Ten Comandements, drawene by Richarde the Hermyte of Hampulle."*⁵

"I. The fyrste Comandement es, 'Thy LORD GOD thou salle loute,⁶ and til Hym anely thou salle serve.' In this Comandement es forboden alle mawmetryse,⁷ alle wychcrafte and charemynges, the whilke may do na remedy tille any seknes of mane, woman or beste; for thay erre the snarrys of the deville, by the whilke he afforces hym to dyssave mankynde. Alswa in this Comandemente es forbodyn to gyffe trouthe till socerye, or to dyvynynges by sternys, or by dremys, or by any swylke thynges; astroumyenes by-haldes the daye, and the houre, and the poynte that man es born in, and undyr whylke syngne he es borne, and the poynte that he begynnes to be in, and by their syngnes and other they say that⁸ salle befall the man aftyrwarde; bot theyre erreure is reproffede of holy doctours. Haly crosses mene salle lowte, for thay are in syngne of CRYSTE crucifiede; to ymages es the lovyng that es till thaym of whaym thaire are the ymages, to that entent anely thaire are for to lowte.

¹ Carrieth.

² Or.

³ Judging, condemning.

⁴ Thinking himself to be something, when he is nothing. A north-countryman will enjoy this phrase.

⁵ From R. Thornton's MS., Linc. Cath. Library.

⁶ Worship.

⁷ Idolatry, the mawmet, or mammet — puppet. In Piers Plowman we have those who "worshippen mawmettes."

⁸ What.

"II. The tothire¹ Comandement es, 'Thou salle noghte take the Name of God in vayne.' Here es forboden athe withowtten cheson.² He that nenenes God³ and sweris fals dispyses God. In thre maners mane may syne in swerryng, that es if he swere agayns his conyence, or if he swere be CRYSTE wondes or blude, that es evermore gret syn thofe it be sothe⁴ that he sweris, for it sounes in irreverence of Jhū CRYSTE; also if he come agaynes his athe noghte fulfilland that he has sworne. The Name of God es takyne in vayne one many maners—with herte, with mouthe, with werke. With herte takes false Crystyne mene it in vayne that rescheyves the Sacrament with-owtten grace in sawle; with mouthe it es tane in vayne with alle athes-brekyng, of new prechyng that es vanyte and undevoeyone—in prayere, when we honour God with oure lippis and oure hertys erre far fra Hym; with werke ypocrites takes Goddes Nam in vayne, for they fegne gud dede with-owttene, and thay erre with-owttene charyte, and vertue, and force of sawle to stand agayne alle ille styrrynges.

"III. The thyrd Comandement es, 'Unbethynke⁵ the that thou halowe thi halydaye.' This Commandement may be takyne in thre maneres: ffirste, generally, that we sesse of all vyces that lettys devoeyone to God; [second] in prayeyng and thynkyng; the thyrd es specyall, als in contemplatyf mene that departis thaym fra all werdly thynges, swa that they hally gyfe thayme till God. The first manere is nedefulle us to do; the tothire we awe⁶ to do; the thirde es perfeccyone. For-thi⁷ on the halydaye men awe, als God byddys, to lefe alle syne and do na werke that lettis thayme to gyffe thaire herte to Godd, that thay halowe the daye in ryst and devoeyone and dedys of charyte.

"IV. The ferthe Comandement es, 'Honoure thy fadyre and thi modyre'—that es, in twa thynges, that es bodyly and gastely. Bodyly in sustenance, that thay be helpede and sustayned in thaire elde,⁸ and when thay are unmyghtty of thayme self. Gastely in reverence and bouxomnes, that thay say to thame na wordes of myrsawe,⁹ ne un-honeste, ne of displeasance unavyssedly, bot serve thame mekely and gladly and lawlyly, that thay wyne [noghte] that Godde hyghte to swylke barnes that es laude of lyghte.¹⁰ And if thay be dede thaym awe to helpe thaire sawles with almous dedes and prayers.

"V. The fife Comandement es, 'That thou slaa na mane, nowthire with assente ne with werke, ne with worde or favour.' And also here es forbodene un-ryghtwyse hurtyng of any person. Thay are slaers gastely that wille noghte feede the pover in nede, and that defames men, and that confoundes innocentys.

"VI. The sexte Comandement es, 'Thou salle be na lichoure.'¹¹

¹ Second.

² Reason.

³ "Takes God's Name." The same idiom is preserved in our modern expression.

⁴ Truth.

⁵ Remember.

⁶ Owe, or ought.

⁷ Wherefore.

⁸ Old age.

⁹ The reading of this word is doubtful.

¹⁰ "That they obtain not that which God promised to such children as are without understanding." The forms *wyne* and *laude* for *win* and *lewd*, occur in the "Prick of Conscience."

¹¹ Lecher.

That es, thou salle have na man or womane bot that thou has takene in fourme of haly kyrke. Alswa here es forbodene alle maner of wilfulle pollusyone procured one any maner agaynes kyndly oys or other gates.¹

"VII. The sevende Comandement es, 'Thow salle noghte do na thyfte,' in the whylke es forboden alle manere of with-draweynge of other mene thynges wrangwysely, agaynes thaire wylle that aghte it, bot² if it ware en tyme of maste nede when alle thynges erre comone. Also here is forbodene gillery³ of weghte, or of tale, or, of mett, or of mesure, or thorowe okyre,⁴ or violence, or drede, als bedells or foresters duse and mynysters of the kyng, or thurgh extorcyone, als lords duse.

"VIII. The aughten Comandement es, 'Thou salle noghte bere false wytnes agaynes thi neghteboure,' als in assys or cause of matremoyne, and also lyeinges ere forbodene in this comandement and feršwerynge. Bot all lyenges are noghte dedly syne, bot if thay noye till som man bodyly or gastely.

"IX. The nynde Comandemente es, 'Thow salle noghte covayte the hous or other thyng mobile or in-mobile of thi neghtbour with wrange.' Ne thou salle noghte halde other mens gude if thou may zelde thaym, elles thi penaunce saves the noghte.

"X. The tend Comandement es, 'Thow salle noghte covayte thi neghtebour's wyf, ne his servande, ne his maydene, ne mobylls of his.' He lufes God that kepis thire comandementes for lufe. His neghtebour hym awe to lufe als hym-selfe, that es tille the same gude that he lufes hym-selfe to, na-tyng till ill, and that he lufe his neghtbour saule mare than his body or any gudes of the worlde."

We hope on another occasion to illustrate the teaching of the Northumbrian hermit on some other points, as also to give some account of his "Office," that singular monument of a "home-made" saint, elevated into the dignity of beatification without waiting for the *imprimatur* of Rome.

THE SUPPLY AND TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

FIRST ARTICLE.

THE importance of discovering the cause of the present scarcity of candidates for Holy Orders cannot be exaggerated. If the Church is, as all good Catholics believe, the appointed instrument for accomplishing the world's regeneration, and the clergy are the springs by which her machinery is worked, it is of the utmost moment that any failure in the sources from which they are drawn

¹ "Against natural use, or other ways."

³ Deceit, cheating.

² Except.

⁴ Usury.

should be remedied as speedily as is consistent with safety. Upon this point we cannot conceive a difference of opinion ; but there seems to be a difference of opinion as to the nature of the lack of clergy. On the one hand it is said that the number of candidates for ordination is absolutely decreasing, whilst it is maintained on the other hand that the decrease is more apparent than real. The former view is supported by statistics, which certainly look alarming. The present Archbishop of Canterbury in his primary charge made the following statement :

“Between the year 1850 and the year 1861, the number of clergy in England and Wales had risen from 17,621 to 19,195. In spite of this increase, it was quite clear that the number of candidates ordained had diminished on an average about 65 per year.”

Mr. Espin, in his paper read before the Manchester Church Congress, said :

“Our spiritual agency, so far from exhibiting expansion for its gigantic task, shows signs of pining away before our eyes. In face of the tremendous arrears of pastoral work, and of a heavy annual accumulation on those arrears, our latest ordinations have been the smallest, and during the last twenty years the decline in the numbers admitted to Holy Orders has been tolerably regular. Against 606 ordained in 1841, the numbers for recent years stand thus : 1860, 567 ; 1861, 570 ; 1862, 489 ; 1863, 450 or 460. It is stated that as yet the admissions to the ministry keep pace with the losses from natural causes.”

We may add to these remarks of Mr. Espin, that the ordinations of 1864 exhibit some improvement in number.

In opposition to the above it is said, that the absorption of curates in livings yearly vacated by pluralists, and in the incumbencies of new parishes, accounts for the lack of curates, and the constant drain for mission and other work out of this country, accounts for the decrease in the candidates for ordination. Doubtless there is some truth in this, but we cannot rest satisfied whilst we have the fact before us, that some hundreds of curacies are vacant (estimated at 600,) and work is waiting to be done in entirely new fields, and cannot be done for lack of labourers. This claims our consideration the more seriously, on the ground that Oxford and Cambridge have seldom been so full of students as they are now, that the theological colleges continue to offer us their imperfectly taught candidates in alarming abundance, that clerical immigrants pour in from Ireland, and literates are accepted by the Bishops with perilous frequency.

A rector a week or two ago, given to be jocose occasionally, was relating his perplexity about obtaining a curate in the following manner : “I have waited patiently for a year, and have never had

an application for my curacy. I have applied *in formâ pauperis* to many a curate, offering him kind treatment, a share in the work not the lion's, a good service, handsome church, and £120 a year, and not one would have me. To-day I have been seriously alarmed by two applications, one from a university-man, another from a literate. The former soon discovered that I should not suit him, and I shall consider myself blessed if I suit the latter." The clerical advertisements in the *Guardian* prove that our rector's difficulties are not singular. These advertisements are a real study for a philanthropist. Week after week some unlucky rector advertises for a curate, and has to try yet another week. We have seen one advertisement off and on for several months; the stipend offered at first was £120 a year, but it seems that none would pity the sorrows of that poor rector, although known to be both an amiable and an able man; nay, the addition of £5 a year to the stipend did not tempt the youth of England into the labours of a poor population. In a recent *Guardian*, picked at random out of a heap, we find advertisements by twenty-six incumbents for curates, fair stipends being offered in all cases but one or two; and advertisements by nine curates requiring curacies, one being audacious enough even to advertise for a living. Contrast this with the last century, when a rich and rosy pluralist could sit at home at ease, and have his three benefices *served* for the magnificent annual sum of £50! Ichabod indeed!

Now in business the law of supply and demand is tolerably uniform, and wherever a demand exists it is met by an adequate supply, if adequate inducements are offered. This principle will not always apply in spiritual things. It has been too hastily assumed that it will apply, and hence so little progress towards the discovery of the real origin of the scarcity of clergy. In secular things secular advantages will produce a host of candidates for them, but in spiritual things secular advantages will not always produce the same result. Mr. Espin says:

"Regarded as a profession by which a man may earn his bread, the Church is by far the worst of all. Two-thirds of our parochial clergy receive for their services a pittance varying from one to three pounds a week. Throw into the reckoning the late age at which a man is admitted to this profession, the consequent number of years he must pass in preparation for it—preparation ordinarily expensive and always at the time unremunerative—the expectations which people have of a clergyman, especially of an incumbent, as regards style of living, liberality and so on; all things taken into account, I doubt whether any walk in life in any age or country ever presented less attractions as a profession than the Church does amongst ourselves."

The conclusion at which Mr. Espin arrives is, that if we want plenty of good men we must pay them better. This is a fair

specimen of secular reasoning applied to spiritual things ; but does it to any considerable extent account for the scarcity ? It only applies to those men in whose motives for becoming priests there is at least a strong ingredient of the worldly, and who not only consider themselves worthy of their hire, but worthy of more hire than they are likely to get. A tolerably large acquaintance with laymen who have passed through the Oxford and Cambridge theological course, such as it is, but who have not been ordained, convinces us, that, if this money motive is to any great extent the moving cause of the hesitation of which we complain, it is very skilfully concealed.

There are many reasons why men seek ordination, and before we can discover a remedy for our present dearth of candidates, we must inquire what these reasons are, and then inquire further whether the circumstances of the Church afford a sufficient solution of the difficulty.

Foremost in the rank of our candidates for Holy Orders stand those brave men, who have sat down and deliberately calculated the cost of their venture, and see fairly before them what they will have to do and to suffer, and, seeing, joyfully hail it as the calling in which to cast their lot, and are determined that the burning fire within their souls shall give birth to mighty deeds for God, and consume in the power of His strength "the wood, hay, and stubble," which have been cast into the Church by the world, the flesh, and the devil.

There are others of a weaker faith, who are not yet prepared to sacrifice all for CHRIST, and not yet ready to encounter the labour and the suffering which necessarily falls upon every priest sincerely bent upon doing his proper work.

There are others (a numerous body too) for whom what are jocosely called "family livings" are waiting, or as it is still more jocosely called "*being warmed*," as if the livings, left to the heating properties of those for whom they are retained, are likely to be cold indeed.

There are others who achieve distinction at the universities, and are elected to Fellowships, on the title of which they, with more or less uprightness of heart, are frequently ordained.

There are others who are well described by the Bishop of Oxford :¹

"A young man has been destined for Holy Orders by his friends, perhaps by pious friends ; he is naturally of a quiet disposition, has no strong passions to lead him astray, has no very robust qualities to fit him to struggle for a high place in the rougher walks of life ; he is early destined for the ministry as a profession ; he finds himself so destined, and he acquiesces : he grows up a thoroughly respectable young man, with no definite religious character, no strongly marked features

¹ Addresses to Candidates for Holy Orders, p. 26.

of inward piety : but it is a mode of life which suits him ; he wishes and hopes to be useful, to get his comforts round him, to take a gentleman's rank in society, and, in return for giving up the possible chance of wealth or worldly distinction, to have without much effort an ascertained place in good society, and perhaps, if matters turn out favourably, facilities for early family life and its quiet happiness."

There are others who have no religious intention whatever in seeking Ordination, but who merely wish to make it subserve their own worldly advancement, just as the farmer thrashes his corn, or the tradesman sells his goods. They will be priests, when they have had the imposition of hands, and they will make the most money they can by their trade.

There are others, probably a large class, who have great individuality of character, and really intend to give all their powers to a clergyman's work, but who too readily fall into the prevailing idea that they will be happy, and respected by the general world, if they only do their duty. In their youth they see little or nothing of a priest's *work*, τὸ καλὸν ἔργον (1 Tim. iii. 1,) and therefore know nothing of his trials, discovering them alone by partaking of them.

These classes appear to embrace the great bulk of our candidates for Ordination. I do not venture to assign any distinct proportion to any one class. It may be different at different times, and the proportion this year may not be the proportion next. What we wish to settle now is this:—are there any circumstances in the Church at the present time which press heavily on any of the classes above-enumerated, and which are likely to deter those who compose them from seeking admission to her ministry ? With regard to the first class it was never large, and the personal character of the clergy would lead to the belief that it is as great now as it ever was. Difficulties, and dangers, and ill-report, are only so many charms to the faithful. We have no rules to propose for such men as these ; their aim is taken, and the arrow will fly at the mark whatever we may do. Neither can we hurt the candidates for family livings. They will not decrease until there are no family livings for them. Perhaps clerical Fellows of colleges are not so numerous as formerly, but their decrease is more than made up by the increase of some of the other classes. We come now to the *respectable* men, who are "very good sort of fellows in their way," as the phrase goes, but who are not troubled with deep convictions, and are ordained without meaning any harm, and without meaning any particular good ; respectability, social standing, &c., these are their gods, and as the number who worship these gods is not smaller than it used to be amongst laymen, we may reasonably assume that it is not smaller amongst clergymen. Candidates for respectability will never fail whilst the Church is dressed in gay clothing,

but there will be a general retreat when she puts on mourning apparel. We cannot say much about the increase or decrease of the next class, the men who have a bad intention in seeking admission to Holy Orders. There always will be such men, it is one of the trials of the Church, and we would fain hope that they are not so numerous as formerly.

The reader will observe that we have said nothing about the increase or decrease of two of the classes of candidates which we mentioned, viz., those of weak faith, and those entertaining false impressions as to the clerical life. These have been purposely omitted, because we wished to deal with them at greater length, as it is mainly to them that we must look for the present scarcity of our candidates for ordination. To begin with, they are good men, and intend to do their duty if ever they are Priests; but many of them hang back; they can see more than they could of the peculiar trials and labours of the life they contemplate, there is more publicity given to them than formerly, and they dare not go any further. Many an example of this hesitation might be brought forward, but here is one as a specimen of the rest. Two brothers, both known to the writer of this article, passed through the Cambridge course, the elder taking a high degree with a high personal character, the younger a low degree with a personal character but moderate. The younger is now vicar of an important parish, after having been in the priesthood four years; the elder is still a layman, but engaged in parochial work, the labour of which puts the clergyman's labour to the blush. This layman longed to go into Orders, the Bishop would gladly have accepted him, every one of his friends urged him, but his faith was too clear not to see the trials which a priest with a tender conscience is sure to meet with, and not strong enough to bind itself to such trials by obligations from which there is no escape. The mere fact of being a minister and steward of God's mysteries supposes a cross, a burden, a fight, a continual warfare; these are the terms on which he takes his office, the same terms on which his Master took it, antagonism with the worldly element in himself and others, friendship alone with God and the good. The circumstances of the Church never will change in this respect: if they do, it will either be by the return of CHRIST to claim His own, or by the return of that deadly security which cries peace, when there is no peace. So long as the Church fulfils her mission, she is the handmaid of suffering, and in proportion to the ebb or flow of her zeal, so is the ebb or flow of her trial.

At the present time it is evident that the Church is undergoing a trial of an unusually severe nature. Dr. Pusey has many times sounded the note of warning, a note which has been echoed by thoughtful churchmen of all phases of sentiment. Bishop Ellicott in his Charge of 1864, having traced the various forms of doubt in the Church, continues thus,—

"Such are the principal forms of doubt and misbelief now existing in the very bosom of Christian society, such is the general nature of the principles now most prominently arrayed against catholic truth. That the combination they now present is frightful no one can deny, and that the future will see that combination much more consolidated in principle, and united in action is, I believe, certainly to be expected. The history of opinion, and the sure word of prophecy, both point in the same direction. It is worse than idle to hope that the evil spirit of misbelief will in any way be changed except for the worse. We must prepare for collision and conflict, trying times are drawing near."

The answer that obviously suggests itself to all this is, that, when the Church has been in trial, the ranks of her leaders have usually been more readily supplied, so that we must not look to trial for the cause of the scarcity of clergy. We willingly grant that when the Church has been in conflict she has never lacked officers for her army, that is, when she has had to contend with foes *without*, not *within*. The tendency of continued confusion within the camp is to disperse its occupants, and to prevent the coming in of fresh recruits; but attacks from without keep the besieged on the alert, and watchfulness and exercise makes them good soldiers, and recruits are not lacking. In early times the martyrdom of the clergy only increased their number, but at the Reformation, when the strife was within the Church, the clergy decreased. "The universities and schools had been comparatively deserted. It was with extreme difficulty that men could now be found to preach at Paul's Cross, once the object of so much clerical ambition. About the year 1544, Bonner writes to Parker, importuning him to send him help from Cambridge, and expressing his surprise that candidates should be lacking for such an office. 'I think there be at this day,' says Latimer, in the middle of Edward VI.'s reign, 'ten thousand students less than were within these twenty years.'"¹ Internal convulsions, physical, social, political, or moral, weaken the body; but if the body be strong within, it can resist the action of external elements with very little loss.

It will be impossible here to enter into the details of the Church's trial at any great length, but there are some which have such a peculiarly powerful influence upon the admission of candidates for her orders that we must not pass them by.

We have said that our decrease must be mainly sought for amongst the weak and the timid, but sincere men. Before men like these will bind themselves for life by the most awful vows, they will inquire what those vows are, and whether there will be anything in the character of their position to prevent them from observing them. And when they make such an inquiry they discover that

¹ Blunt's Sketch of the Reformation, p. 160.

if they are to carry out their views, it must be in the face of continual opposition from within, from those who ought to help them, perhaps from those they dearly love. They see that they will have to suffer tyranny, injustice, malice, persecution from their brethren, and is it any wonder that a timid faith should quail at such a prospect, and a seeker after happiness should stand appalled?

There are four of the vows in the Ordination Service for Priests which require the most courageous faith to fulfil. Here is one.

“Will you give your *faithful diligence always* so to minister the doctrine and Sacraments, and the discipline of CHRIST, as the LORD hath commanded, and as this Church and realm hath received the same, according to the commandments of GOD; so that you may *teach the people* committed to your cure and charge, *with all diligence to keep and observe the same*?

“*Answer.* I will so do, by the help of the LORD.”

What does this mean? The common reply of those who regard matters of discipline as of no great consequence is, that we are to carry out as much of the law of the Church as is consistent with the state of feeling of the large majority of churchmen, in a word, as much as is expedient. Even Dr. Pusey, in a recent letter to a clergyman in the diocese of Ely, appears to sanction this principle, in this, however, following the example set him by most of the Upper House of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury. But is this the way in which the ardent, loving, simple mind of a young man of two or three and twenty would interpret the vow? Without deciding whether he is right or wrong, would he not interpret the vow to mean, that he is to obey all the canons, the rubrics, and other laws which the Church has sanctioned? Here is his difficulty,—when he looks at the Canons he sees he cannot obey some, that he dare not obey others, and that the authority of others has been destroyed by Acts of Parliament. Neither does an attentive study of the rubrics give him more satisfaction. He cannot be content, as some of his brethren are, with Sunday religion, when his vow binds him to daily prayers; with the Genevan gown, when his vow binds him to priestly vestments; with monthly celebrations, when his vow binds him to weekly; with the general truths of Christianity, when his vow binds him to sacramental teaching. If he were conscientiously to carry out the provisions of this vow, he knows from what he sees, and hears, and reads, that he would have to bear so much persecution, that he would faint under the burden, and he hesitates. We offer no opinion here upon the conduct of priests who are already engaged in the work, neither do we here offer any opinion as to the common interpretation of this vow; but we repeat the fact that the impossibility, so to speak, of observing it thins our ranks.

The next vow runs thus:

"Will you be ready, *with all faithful diligence*, to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word, &c.?"

"*Answer.* I will, the LORD being my helper."

To limit this vow to opposition to any one phase of error, or to that which seems to the individual priest to be error, is manifestly a proceeding which the words do not contemplate. It has reference to every form of doctrinal error, the only test of error being that it is contrary to the teaching of God's Word, and therefore of the Catholic Church, which is "the pillar and ground of the truth." It is surprising in the addresses to candidates for Orders, how lightly the Bishops and Professors trip over this ground. They tell us that the best way to root out error is to teach what is not error, and no doubt this is so; but there is a negative side to the question. In addition to telling the people what is right, the Priest has to tell them what is wrong,—to tell them in love, but to tell them nevertheless. And here is one of his peculiar difficulties,—dogmatic teaching of catholic truth is unpalatable to the mass of churchmen, and a sermon, if it is worth anything, directed against the various forms of heresy and schism which desolate the land, will commonly draw down upon the unfortunate orator an amount of observation the reverse of complimentary; and if he should venture upon *private* exhortation to the holders of false doctrine, it is well if he escapes without personal insult. We are far from affirming that there are no priests who conscientiously adhere to the letter of this vow and succeed; they are men whom we never need be afraid of losing; but what we wish to affirm is, that the danger and difficulty of observing the terms of the vow deter many a good man from the ministry of the Church which exacts it.

The next vow runs thus:

"Will you be diligent in prayers, and in reading of the Holy Scriptures, and in such studies as help to the knowledge of the same, laying aside the study of the world and the flesh?"

"*Answer.* I will endeavour myself so to do, the LORD being my helper."

What is commonly the result of this vow? Unfortunately, as soon as a candidate is ordained he is compelled, if he be appointed to serve in any of those large parishes where the need of clergy is greatest, to make his prayers and studies as short as is consistent with the barest exercise of duty. If he had his priestly work alone to do, he would be able to give proper attention to his devotional exercises, to the improvement both of his own character and the character of his people; but being encumbered with work which ought to be done by the deacons, or the minor orders, or the laity, he has to let the cultivation of his inner life suffer considerably. All men are not of such giant mental organization as

S. Augustine, who could say, "*ante meridiem et post meridiem occupationibus hominum implicor*," and yet find time and power to write a small library; and we must not be surprised if men of only ordinary capacity are afraid to promise what they know well enough other engagements, only accidentally beneficial, will certainly prevent. The Dissenters manage to secure for their teachers an amount of leisure which enables them to read and pray; and, though they expect them to be slaves, they do not expect them to be a sort of jack-of-all-trades, and we consequently do not hear of any lack of candidates for what they call their ministry. Besides this, the social habits into which a young man knows that he will be drawn, so soon as he settles down to a curacy, are enough to deter many a scrupulous mind from adventuring on a work which he knows can only be discharged in the spirit of an ascetic. Such an one needs, if not the vow of celibacy, yet at least some strong encouragement, if he should attempt it as a rule of life, which he knows that he will not find.

The fourth vow with which we have to deal runs thus :

"Will you reverently obey your ordinary, and other chief ministers, unto whom is committed the charge and government over you, following with a glad mind and will their godly admonitions, and submitting yourselves to their godly judgments?"

"*Answer.* I will do so, the LORD being my helper."

Some obscurity has been cast over the meaning of the above, by the forced interpretations of those who endeavour to reconcile the profession with the present practice; but the Bishop of Oxford's explanation will commend itself to minds of the thoughtful and sincere, who seek for no subterfuge. He says,¹ the priest

"promises, that in respect of his exercise of that ministry into which he seeks to be admitted, he will submit his will to the commands, and his practice to the judgment of his spiritual rulers, within the limits of those laws by which they as well as he are bound; subject only to the further limitation, that nothing which is contrary to GOD's revealed will can be by them rightly ordered, or by him lawfully obeyed."

This explanation being accepted, is not the newly-made priest placed between two stools, the law and its administrators? Bishops have no power to command the clergy to break the law, but they do so, and do so frequently. What a figure some of our Bishops, Deans, and Archdeacons, would cut in the courts if some ill-natured person were to prosecute them for breaking the law! The example to the lower clergy is not animating as far as obedience to their vows is concerned; but that is not a matter for us, what we complain of is the influence, direct and indirect, which they bring to bear upon those who are desirous of keeping their

¹ *Addresses*, p. 252.

vows, to compel them to do otherwise. Incumbents are able to resist if they will, but if any of the five or six thousand curates were to resist the unlawful order of a superior they might have their licence summarily revoked, with only a month to make a precarious appeal to the Archbishop, and so be cast adrift on the world. The law relating to curates is in many respects objectionable, but in this it is absolutely cruel. A curate may certainly shelter himself under the generally received maxim that he is only part of his incumbent, and may safely do whatever he is told, but that is not the law. In the eyes of the law, both of the Church and Realm, he has his own identity as a priest, and can be punished for a breach of any legal direction, even though it should be commanded by his superior. This dilemma is, to use the mildest epithet, perplexing.

We observe, then, from what has been said, that the circumstances in which our Church is at present placed contributed very materially to the decrease of the clergy, by making it extremely difficult for good and conscientious men to fulfil their ordination-vows. Four vows of the eight, which they have to make, require almost superhuman courage to obey, and it is because so few good men possess such courage that they dare not enter the priesthood. We are convinced that, until something is done to remove this impediment, worthy candidates will be lacking continually. In the world's business the rules and regulations which its servants have to sign, are from time to time revised, so that when a promise of abiding by them is made the promise may be capable of fulfilment; but not so in the Church. Things in themselves not absolutely essential to her well-being, are allowed to gather rust in the progress of ages; and when the rust is thick upon them every attempt to polish them is resisted, not from without but from within. Give to the Church of England the power of fulfilling her divine mission, and exercising her divine right of setting things in order which are wanting, by the combined wisdom of representatives from all estates within her, and we feel sure that such laws would be enacted as would procure the acquiescence of all parties, and would destroy the barrier which now hinders so many desirable persons from offering themselves as candidates for her ministry. Partial representation would not receive the confidence of the Church, and the laws enacted would receive only a partial obedience; but let all be represented, Bishops, Clergy, and Laymen (the latter of course not as legislators,) in an assembly sanctioned by Catholic practice, and there need be no fear for a good result.

What, however, will it be if the Bishops still pursue that ruinous practice of accepting candidates for orders? It would be better by far to trust to the private training of Clergy, at the same time raising the standard of examination, than to give en-

couragement to such institutions as Lampeter, and S. Aidan's, and S. Bee's. In due time these men will be the beneficed clergy of the country, and will represent the Church in Convocation, and what chance will there be then of ordering the Church upon Catholic models? And what well-educated, upright curate will feel happy under the guidance of a man, defective perhaps in his moral as well as his mental character? The ministry of the Church will sink very low indeed, and the triumph of heresy will follow as a matter of course. If the being of our Church depended upon the approval of the popular voice, we should say, use popular arts to cause that voice to speak in her favour, but "her foundations are upon the holy hills" of God's everlasting decrees, and it is only by exercising all her powers that she can hope to win souls. This is the first remedy, we believe, for our internal disorders. It may seem like following a phantom in attempting to attain to such an end; but it appears to us, that if half the strength which is devoted to flannel-societies and tea-drinkings were devoted to the restoration of the active powers of the Church, we should soon have them in operation. One of the best of our Bishops, in a recent charge, remarked, that "a good Bishop will always have plenty of good candidates for orders." And to a certain extent this is true; but then to receive a plentiful supply of clergy we ought always to have good Bishops, whereas our present circumstances frequently place the indifferent prelates in dioceses where clergy are most needed. It appears to us, that the supply of candidates should not depend any more than is absolutely unavoidable upon the personal character of the occupant of a see; such regulations ought to be made as would, with a due degree of certainty, ensure the filling up of vacant posts of every degree as soon as they are vacant, and it is because we need such regulations that we need clergy. And yet in the meanwhile much may be done to remedy our need, and of this we shall treat in a future Number.

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

It has frequently been asserted, and it cannot be doubted, with *apparent* reason, that the teaching of S. Paul is opposed to the doctrines and usages of the Catholic Church. Not merely in modern times, as at the period of the Reformation, and subsequently, has this statement been made, but we find from the earliest date of ecclesiastical history protests against the received teaching of Catholicity, principally as being opposed (such is the assertion) to the teaching of S. Paul. The opinions of Marcion, a well known heretic of the second century, are thus described by the ec-

clesiastical historian, Neander. After saying that "Marcion adopted the view of faith, *πίστις*, according to the genuine sense of S. Paul, and not according to the merely outward and more truly Jewish than Christian notion of *πίστις*, which had found admission into the Christian Church;" the historian adds, "We perceive in him (Marcion) the first symptom of a reaction necessary in the course of the historical evolution—a reaction of the Pauline type of doctrine reclaiming its rightful authority against the strong leaning of the Church to the side of James and Peter, a reaction of the Christian consciousness reasserting the independence acquired for it by the labours of Paul against a new combination of Jewish and Christian elements, a reaction of the Protestant spirit against the Catholic element, now swelling in the bud."¹

In the seventh century a sect arose known by the name of Paulicians, a name, as modern writers almost universally agree,² which was given them on account of their alleged adherence to the doctrines of S. Paul against the supposed errors of the Catholic Church. Dollinger says, "Through the whole course of ecclesiastical history down to the latest period of the middle ages we may trace an unbroken succession of Gnostic-Manichæan doctrines and sects. Together with the Manichees the Marcionites also appear to have maintained themselves for a long time, and particularly in Syria. Theodoret found them in great numbers in his diocese. The Paulicians were, it is more than probable, a new formation of these sects: they derived their name, not from their founder³ or their more early chiefs,—the brothers Paul and John the sons of the Manichæan woman Callinche—but rather from the Apostle S. Paul, whose doctrines they pretended to follow in opposition to the doctrines of the other Apostles, and especially of S. Peter. From the disciples of S. Paul they borrowed the names of their superiors, and designated their communities after the churches which he had either planted or regulated."⁴

Again, vestiges of Paulicianism may also be found amongst the Albigenses, probably an offshoot from them. In the writings also of the mystics of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries the teaching of the Church is often attacked from the "stand point" of the theology of S. Paul. A modern writer thus speaks of the theology of one of the writers, John of Goch: "Without neglecting

¹ Neander's Church History, vol. ii. p. 166.

² Gibbon, "Roman Empire," c. 54. Neander, v. 37. Giesler, "Church History," vol. ii. 209. Maitland, "Albigenses and Waldenses," p. 445. Kurtz, "History of the Christian Church," p. 260, (Clark, trans.) Robertson, "Christian Church," vol. ii. p. 165.

³ The founder of the sect was a Gnostic, probably a Marcionite-Gnostic, a Syrian named Constantine (Sylvanus,*) who between the years 657 and 684 disseminated his doctrines with great success, &c. Dollinger, *in loc.*

⁴ Ecclesiastical History, vol. iii. p. 39.

* He was so called from the name of one of S. Paul's companions, (2 Cor. i. 19; 1 Thess. i. 1, &c.)

CHRIST's own sayings in the Gospels, and the works of the other Apostles, and especially John, the writings of Paul, and above all the weighty passages in the Epistles to the Romans and Galatians, form the mainstays upon which Goch rests his theological disquisitions. In all his writings he appears imbued with the spirit of the Apostle of the Gentiles, and deeply and vitally smitten with a relish for his doctrine of justification through faith working by love."¹ Of another mystic we are told, "As in the case of all the great men connected with the Reformation, [more correctly its precursors] we can distinguish in the views of [John of] Wesel, two fundamental elements, 1. Reverence for the whole Bible; 2. Special reverence for the Epistles of S. Paul, the latter somewhat tinged by the works of Augustine."²

At the Reformation in the sixteenth century the teaching of S. Paul was most especially and prominently brought forward in opposition to the dogmas and usages of the Catholic Church. Thus the doctrine of the Apostle of justification by faith was, as Luther supposed, wholly opposed to many important doctrines or usages of the Church. In England also the teaching of S. Paul was principally cited in the controversy with Rome, and by referring to Foxe's Acts and Monuments we shall see in what respects the Roman and Pauline teaching were supposed to be contradictory. Foxe says, "The sum of S. Paul's doctrine delivered to the Gentiles—first, the doctrine of S. Paul ascribeth all our justification freely and merely to faith only in CHRIST, as to the only means and cause immediate whereby the merits of CHRIST's Passion be applied unto us, without any other respect of work or works of the law whatsoever; and in this doctrine the Church of the Romans was first planted. . . . Item, it wipeth away all traditions and constitutions of men whatsoever, especially from binding the conscience, calling them beggarly elements of this world. . . . Item, the right vein of S. Paul's doctrine putteth no difference nor observation in days and times, (Gal. iv. 10; Colos. ii. 8.) Item, it leaveth all meats to be indifferent with thanksgiving to serve the necessity of the body, and not the body to serve them, (Colos. ii. 21; 1 S. Tim. iv. 3.) Item, it permitteth marriage without restraint or exception lawful and also expedient for all men having need thereof, (1 Cor. vii. 2.) Item, it admitteth no sacrifice for sin but the sacrifice of CHRIST alone, and that done once for all with blood; for without blood there is no remission of sin, which is applied to us by faith only, and by nothing else, (Heb. ix. 22.)"³

Now it must candidly be admitted that the above extracts show at least an apparent discordance on some points between the teaching of S. Paul and that of the Catholic Church. The Church,

¹ Ullmann's *Reformers before the Reformation*, vol. i. p. 39, (Clark, trans.)

² *Ibid.* p. 294.

³ Vol. i., pp. 62, 63.

e.g., has enjoined the observance of certain festival days, and also of days of fasting or abstinence ; one day is to be kept holy perhaps in commemoration of an apostle or saint, and is thus not to be regarded as a common or ordinary one. Such has been the usage of the Church in all ages ; now let us hear the teaching of S. Paul.

"One believeth that he may eat all things, another who is weak eateth herbs ; let not him that eateth despise him that eateth not ; and let not him which eateth not judge him that eateth, for God hath received him. . . . One man esteemeth one day above another, another esteemeth every day alike : let every man be fully persuaded in his own mind. . . . I know and am persuaded by the LORD JESUS CHRIST, that there is nothing unclean of itself, but to him that esteemeth any thing to be unclean, to him it is unclean. But if thy brother be grieved with thy meat, now walkest thou not charitably, destroy not him with thy meat for whom CHRIST died, . . . for the kingdom of God is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the HOLY GHOST," (Rom. xiv.)

Now what is the impression which seems obviously to be derived from these passages and other declarations of similar import, (as 1 Cor. viii. 8 ; Colos. ii. 16,) but that all days are really alike, and that it is immaterial whether one be observed with greater respect than another ; also that a distinction of meats is quite unimportant, since whether we eat or abstain from certain kinds of food are we either the better or the worse : the "weak" brother who thinks it right to eat herbs only must not be grieved or offended by one who has superior knowledge and spiritual discernment, since we should not walk charitably (mark the terms "weak" brother, and not walking "charitably") if by meat and drink we destroy a brother for whom CHRIST died.

Thus S. Paul appears to be the advocate of certain latitudinarian or so-called protestant theories of religion, too well known, alas, in the present day ; but his teaching, it must be borne in mind, has only yet been imperfectly put forth ; we shall presently find that the Apostle's real meaning has been in a great measure mistaken and misrepresented.

But in order to understand the Pauline system, and to show its connection with and bearing upon Catholic Christianity ; we must speak at some length on the true nature of the Church, with especial reference to the preparatory system of Judaism.

The most striking characteristic of the ancient dispensation was its typical nature. It was mainly designed, as we are distinctly told in the New Testament, to prepare the world for that new and everlasting kingdom which CHRIST was to establish upon earth. It foreshadowed CHRIST's Church by types, and prepared the world by a true though imperfect outline to receive it. S. Paul tells us that the Law was a *shadow of good things to come*, and he mentions typical portions of the Old Testament which corresponded with the

New, (Heb. ix. 9.) After relating the judgments which befel the Israelites, he adds that "all these things happened unto them as types," τύποι, (1 Cor. x.,) and in writing to the Galatians he compares the Jewish dispensation to a child put under tutors and governors, and thus preparing for the duties and privileges of riper age, (Gal. iv.)

The ancient dispensation being thus typical of the Christian Church, it is manifest and is indeed implied in the very nature of a type, that there must be a correspondence more or less exact between them. It is impossible that the one could be unlike or of diverse character to the other. The Christian Church it might be anticipated would be of a higher and more glorious character than the dispensation which prefigured it, yet as being its antitype there must be obvious marks of identity between them. How could the Jewish dispensation have been in any sense typical of the Christian Church, if so far from resembling, they are quite dissimilar to each other? Now let this fact be borne in mind, which is too clear and unmistakeable to need further illustration, as being alone sufficient to refute a popular theory of the Church, which represents it as being without a form of government of divine appointment, or any definite creed or ritual of worship, but simply a religion of the heart and affections; leaving its members in what are called external matters to follow their own taste, or as it is said, the spirit and requirements of the age. Had such been the true form of Christianity and the real meaning of the teaching of JESUS CHRIST and His apostles, the ancient dispensation would not only have been without use or value as *preparatory* to Christianity, but would rather have been an impediment to its reception. It would not have been our schoolmaster to lead us to CHRIST, but would have driven us away from Him by presenting wholly untrue and unworthy ideas of His religion and of the service most acceptable to Him.

But whilst maintaining that there must be a *striking* and *unmistakeable* correspondence between the Jewish and the Christian Church, there may be of course a difference of opinion, as to certain portions of this correspondence, but not as to the main and leading points of resemblance. Now what in the ancient dispensation, more prominently and especially claims our attention than its sacrificial character? The fundamental idea of Judaism will be changed if we eliminate the priesthood and the altar. How can it be supposed then if we pay any regard whatever to the correspondence between type and antitype, that the Christian Church prefigured by a priestly dispensation has neither altar, priest nor sacrifice? In the typical dispensation, an invasion of the priestly office by Korah, Dathan, and Abiram was visited by death in its most appalling form, and can we believe that the Christian priesthood is an office which any one may assume

uncalled ; or as some imagine, which all believers can discharge with equal validity ?

Independently therefore, of patristic evidence or of quotations from holy Scripture, we may feel assured that the Christian Church if it be the antitype of Judaism, must have an altar and sacrifice. The Jewish dispensation we may say compels us to hold this view and would alone suffice for its defence and proof. *The Levitical ritual establishes beyond all question the Christian priesthood.*

The correspondence which has been stated between type and antitype was clearly perceived in the primitive Church. The early Fathers do not rest their proof of the doctrine of the priesthood upon passages from the Gospels or the Apostolic Epistles, nor do they ever treat the subject as if it involved any doubt or controversy. Thus it cannot be said that the doctrine of the priesthood was founded by the Fathers on a mistaken view of the meaning of holy Scripture, which it might perhaps be alleged that modern scholarship has shown to be erroneous. The truth of the doctrine was not based by the Fathers upon a mere interpretation of Scripture but upon Apostolical command or sanction. We read of the altar and the holy Oblation in the Apostolical Canons and in the Epistles of S. Ignatius, indicating beyond doubt, the sacrificial worship of the Church from the earliest period. In the writings of the early Fathers, there is neither dispute nor controversy on the doctrine of the eucharistic Oblation : it was offered from the apostolic age—the antitype of Levitical sacrifices—throughout the world, and even heretics as the Gnostics imitated in their profane rites the true worship of the Catholic Church. Thus the doctrine of the priesthood could not have been a gradual corruption of the truth, even had it been possible that such a corruption could have taken place, that is, that this doctrine could have originated from a totally opposite system ; the Apostolic Fathers also speak of the altar and sacrifice, as distinctly as their successors in after ages. But although the doctrine of the Christian priesthood was not founded on mere biblical interpretation, the Fathers appealed to Holy Scripture in its illustration or proof ; and especially the correspondence between Judaism and Christianity as type and antitype in regard to sacrifice and ritual was traced.¹

We have now proved that Christianity as the antitype of Judaism is a priestly system, a fact which must be carefully borne in mind

¹ See e.g., S. Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Tryph. § 40, 41. He says, § 42, “that all things commanded by Moses were types, symbols and announcements (τύπους καὶ συμβολὰς καὶ καταγγέλλας) of the things which were to come to pass in CHRIST.” S. Irenæus, *Advers. Hæres.*, in the fourth book often alludes to the typical nature of Judaism. Thus he says, Moses was taught on the mount “præfigurationes futurorum,” (xiv. § 3,) and he speaks of God in giving the Jewish ceremonial law, as “miserans eorum cæcitati, et verum sacrificium insinuans (c. xviii. § 2,) Munera autem et oblationes et sacrificia omnia in typo populus accepit,” (xix. § 1.) And afterwards of the Old Testament as “Imagines eorum quæ sunt in Ecclesia præfigurans.” (xxxii. § 2.)

ere we can understand the true nature of the spirituality which S. Paul teaches :—this fact would alone suffice to refute the opinion of Foxe and others, that the merits of CHRIST's passion are applied to us without any works of our own, or by faith only. Foxe rejects, as we have seen, the priestly system of Christianity, and asserts that S. Paul's teaching is wholly opposed to it—a statement which presently will be examined.

Now let us inquire more especially into the teaching of S. Paul. Christianity, according to the Apostle, may be called a spiritual religion, as contrasted with Judaism, and thus higher and more glorious than the preceding one ; this—the former dispensation—S. Paul says, had (as it were) no glory, by reason of that (i.e., of Christianity) that excelleth. That Christianity is a sacrificial system has been already proved, and we shall afterwards show that the same doctrine is clearly implied in the Epistles of S. Paul. Let us now examine the Apostle's teaching, on what may be called the inner character of Christianity as exhibited in the heart and life, which is especially brought before us in his writings.

S. Paul teaches, that in Holy Baptism the fallen children of Adam are washed from inherited corruption, made new creatures, members of CHRIST, and heirs of His kingdom. They are intimately united to Him by His indwelling Spirit, and their LORD abides in them as in His temple. And not only has the Christian been made a new creature through his union with his LORD, but also a citizen of heaven. He has come to Mount Zion, to the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem. Having died to this world, and his life having been hid with CHRIST in God, he must henceforth live by faith as seeing Him that is invisible—faith in the SON of God who has loved him and given Himself for him. Thus triumphing in his deliverance from sin and death, and in his foretaste of heavenly joy, loving his brethren even as his Master has loved him and after His merciful example ; *self* is forgotten and extinguished, *he* lives not, but CHRIST lives in him, and the life which he lives in the flesh he lives by the faith of the SON of God. Can we wonder that to him earthly things have lost all their attractions, are only trifles, vanities, and shadows ? coheir with CHRIST, inheritor of the heavenly kingdom, all things are his, and he is CHRIST's, and CHRIST is God's ; he rejoices evermore, prays without ceasing, in everything gives thanks.

Such, according to S. Paul, is the Christian life, the life of God's redeemed and regenerate children. Can we wonder then that the Apostle speaks in terms of censure, nay almost contempt, of those who regard one kind of meat as being *in itself* better than another, or one day as inferior to another, and thus thought to pervert, by a return to Jewish usages, the spirituality of the Christian religion ? for Jewish usages must be referred to, as the Church had not then appointed either days of observance, or an

abstinence from certain meats. Of course the Apostle *implicitly* condemns all Christian rites and ordinances which are *really* identical with those of the old dispensation, as e.g., all perfunctory fasts, which consist *merely* in the change of one kind of meat for another. If Jewish ordinances, to which the Apostle must allude, do exactly resemble Christian ones, to both must undoubtedly belong the same appellation of weak and beggarly elements. But we deny that Christian ordinances, unless grossly misunderstood and perverted, are identical with those of Judaism—they are not merely outward signs without spiritual efficacy, but are channels of grace to the soul, sacramental signs or emblems which signify and convey Divine gifts and blessings.

Again, the teaching of S. Paul on the inefficiency of all outward rites in themselves, may be considered as intimating *the* all-important revelation of the Gospel, dimly shadowed forth in the old dispensation, but now fully manifested—that man, ere he can be fitted for communion with God and the enjoyment of His Presence in everlasting life, must be renewed in the Divine image, and heavenly dispositions be implanted; he must become a new creature in CHRIST, otherwise the Gospel revelation will be ineffectual, the very object be frustrated for which it was revealed, to make us meet for the inheritance of the saints in light. Thus the Apostle teaches that neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love—"if any man be in CHRIST he is a new creature,"—"without holiness no man can see the LORD." Can it be a matter of surprise, then, that the Apostle should so severely condemn Judaism, who, losing sight of "righteousness, peace, joy in the HOLY GHOST," so far corrupted the Gospel, as to teach that the essence of religion (so to speak) consisted in the observance of certain days, or an abstinence from certain kinds of meat? Well may he speak of the weak and beggarly elements, whereunto the Galatians desired again to be in bondage. "Ye observe days, and months, and times, and years. I am afraid of you, lest I have bestowed upon you labour in vain." (Galat. iv. 9, 10.)

An account shall now be given of the teaching of S. Paul on faith and predestination. Faith has a threefold meaning in the Apostle's writings, (1) the belief of essential or important doctrines of Christianity. Thus S. Paul speaks of "the common faith" (Titus i. 4;) of being "sound in the faith," (Tit. i. 13;) of his having kept the faith," (2 Tim. iv. 7;) and he tells us of Hymeneus and Philetus, "who concerning the truth have erred, saying, that the resurrection is past already, and overthrow the faith of some." (2 Tim. ii. 18.)

Again (2), faith is often spoken of as the condition of justification in Holy Baptism.¹ S. Paul thus writes to the Galatians, "The

¹ See Acts viii. 37; xvi. 31—33; xviii. 8.

Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of JESUS CHRIST might be given to them that believe; but before faith came we were kept under the law, shut up unto the faith which should afterwards be revealed, wherefore the law was our schoolmaster to bring us unto CHRIST that we might be justified by faith; but after that faith came we are no longer under a schoolmaster; for ye are all the children of God by faith in CHRIST JESUS. For as many of you as have been baptized into CHRIST have put on CHRIST. . . . And if ye be CHRIST's then are ye Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise." (Galat. iii. 22—29.) The same doctrine of justification by faith in Holy Baptism is clearly set forth in the third and following chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. The Apostle, after setting forth as in the passage just quoted, man's corrupt and helpless state by nature (iii. 23,) thus speaks of justification by the Gospel, which, in the Apostle's words, is "the righteousness (or justification) of God which is by faith of JESUS CHRIST unto and upon all them that believe," (ver. 22.) "It is (he says) a free justification by His grace," (ver. 24,) and is "for the remission of sins that are past," (ver. 25.) In the next chapter the Apostle illustrates the subject of faith from the example of Abraham, which was given not for his sake only, but for ours also, since the baptised, as we have seen, "are Abraham's seed, and heirs according to the promise."

Again in the beginning of the next chapter (v.) the Apostle says, that having been "justified (*δικαιωθέντες*,) by faith, (i.e. in Holy Baptism,) we have peace with God through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom we have access through faith into this grace wherein we stand," i.e., the state of justification in which we have been placed. Throughout the chapter baptismal justification is frequently alluded to—"having been now justified by His blood (v. 9,) we were reconciled . . . having been reconciled," (v. 10,) "we have now received the atonement," (v. 11,) "the grace of God, and the gift by grace," (v. 15,) "the gift and the free gift," (v. 16,) "abundance of grace, and the gift of righteousness," (v. 17.)

The next chapter (vi.) shows most clearly that the Apostle has been alluding to Holy Baptism, and to the gifts of grace therein received—the one baptism for the remission of sins. The same subject is continued, and it is the Apostle's object to prevent any false inference from his teaching. If our sins have been forgiven, and we have been justified in the laver of Baptism, shall we continue in sin that grace may abound? We have been justified in Baptism, freely through God's undeserved mercy, and on condition of faith only, shall we again live in sin thus so easily pardoned? No, says the Apostle, our past sins have been pardoned, and as Baptism itself typifies a burial with CHRIST, or a crucifixion with Him, we must now regard ourselves as dead with

CHRIST, and also risen with Him, as dead indeed unto sin, but alive unto God through JESUS CHRIST our LORD. Again, the Apostle speaks in language similar to that quoted from the preceding chapter, that we have access by faith into this grace, i.e., state of grace wherein we stand, (v. 2;) and that we are not under the Law, but under grace, i.e. the Gospel state of grace, of free forgiveness of past sins through the blood of CHRIST. The same doctrine of man's guilt and corruption by nature, and his regeneration and justification in Holy Baptism, is also elsewhere clearly stated by the Apostle. See Titus iii. 3—8.

Thus it is clear that the doctrine of justification by faith or faith only, according to the popular acceptance of this doctrine, is *not* taught by S. Paul, but has been founded on a mistake, or misapprehension of his meaning. *He* does not encourage the fallen Christian to hope for forgiveness by a mere act of faith in the Redeemer's merits, but bids him repent of his sins, (2 Cor. xii. 21.) or expels him from the communion of the Church, (as in the case of the incestuous Corinthian,) if his sins have been grievous or flagrant. The godly sorrow which worketh repentance unto salvation is thus described by the Apostle, "what carefulness it wrought in you, yea, what clearing of yourselves, yea, what indignation, yea, what fear, yea, what vehement desire, yea, what zeal, yea, what revenge," (2 Cor. vii. 10—11.) How different is the Apostle's view of the indispensable need of repentance for the pardon of sin and of the true nature of repentance intimated in this passage from that of certain modern teachers, who boast themselves as being his especial followers: instead of urging upon the sinner the indispensable need of repentance for sin, their exhortation is only "believe on CHRIST, and your sins however grievous will be immediately blotted out!" Not that it is to be supposed that by teaching the absolute need of repentance for the pardon of sin we are disparaging the efficacy of the Redeemer's merits, (is it possible that any one can accuse S. Paul of this?) since repentance and those works which attest its reality and sincerity are alone availing for our forgiveness through our Redeemer's most precious bloodshedding.¹

¹ The popular view of justification by faith only has been condemned by the Western Church, as in the Council of Trent: "Si quis dixerit eum qui post baptismum lapsus est, non posse per Dei gratiam resurgere; aut posse quidem sed sola fide amissam justificationem recuperare, sine sacramento poenitentiae . . . anathema sit." Also by the Eastern Church in the Council of Jerusalem, Decret. xiii. Πιστεύομεν οὐ διὰ πίστεως ἀπλῶς μόνως δικαιοῦσθαι τὸν ἄνθρωπον ἀλλὰ διὰ πίστεως καὶ ἐνεργουμένης διὰ τῆς ἀγάπης, ταῦτ' ἐστὶν διὰ τῆς πίστεως καὶ τῶν ἔργων. Τὸ δὲ τὴν πίστιν χεῖρὸς ἔργον ἀποπληροῦσαν ἀντιλαμβάνεσθαι τῆς ἐν Χριστῷ δικαιοσύνης καὶ προσάπειν ἡμῖν εἰς σωτηρίαν πόρρω πύσης εὐσεβείας γινώσκομεν. The phrase "we are justified by faith only" occurs in one of the Articles of the Anglican Church; its meaning will be found in the preceding sentence of the Article, viz., that it is only through the merits of our LORD JESUS CHRIST that we are accounted righteous before God, CHRIST being *re ipsa* the only Justifier, or His merits the only source of our justification.

But justification by faith which brings us to CHRIST, and makes us members of His Body in Holy Baptism, is only a part of the Apostle's teaching respecting faith. Faith may be called the living operating principle in the Christian's heart, the source from which holiness alone can flow. If we would understand the import of faith according to the Apostle's teaching, as when he saith, "with the heart man believeth unto righteousness," let us consider how frequently he speaks of faith and love as being in union with each other—love, referring generally to our love to CHRIST, and sometimes our love to our brethren for His sake. Thus in the Epistle to the Galatians faith is described as working by love, (v. 6,) and the Apostle says that he lived by the faith of the SON of GOD, Who loved him and gave Himself for him; he prays for his Ephesian converts that CHRIST may dwell in their hearts by faith, that they being rooted and grounded in love, may be able to know the love of CHRIST, which passeth knowledge, (Ephes. iii. 17—19,) and his benediction at the close of his Epistle to them is "peace be to the brethren, and love with faith," (vi. 23.) The Apostle informs the Thessalonians that Timothy had brought him good tidings of their faith and love, (1 Thess. iii. 6,) and in describing the Christian armour the breastplate he says is "of faith and love," (Ibid. v. 8;) and in the Epistle to Timothy we read of "the faith and love which is in CHRIST JESUS," (1 Tim. i. 14,) and afterwards Timothy is exhorted to hold fast the form of sound words in faith and love, which is in CHRIST JESUS, (2 Tim. i. 13.) And even in the short Epistle to Philemon there is an allusion to his faith and love towards the LORD JESUS and towards all saints, (v. 5.)

Now the Apostle, by thus connecting together faith and love, indicates the true and only origin of that faith by which we believe with the heart unto righteousness; it is not only inseparably connected with love, but it is entirely founded upon it. We admit that faith sometimes means, according to the usage of S. Paul, a belief of certain propositions, but this is not the sense in which it is commonly used by the Apostle, nor that to which we are now alluding—faith means belief indeed in the ordinary sense of the word, we do not wish to exclude this sense, but it means according to S. Paul infinitely more,—a belief in CHRIST which becomes perfected by love. Faith and love unite us to CHRIST, and cause us to grow in resemblance to Him. When we love another, his society becomes our chief delight, and by intimate communion and intercourse, as we know, friends grow in likeness to each other. Thus is it with the sincere Christian; united by faith and love to his blessed LORD, he is gradually transformed into His image, from glory to glory; faith and love increase as he abounds more and more in the fruits of righteousness, and he rejoices evermore in the foretaste of his heavenly inheritance, "has peace and joy in believ-

ing," till at last in the eternal kingdom he reaches the measure of the stature of the fulness of CHRIST.

The teaching of S. Paul on predestination will form the next subject of inquiry. Now it seems clear, speaking generally of the Apostle's teaching on this doctrine, that predestination has reference to the call of the Gentiles, who instead of the Jews were chosen as God's peculiar people, and that such had been the purpose of God from eternity. Predestination is God's purpose to make the Gentiles members of His Church, and election is the actual carrying into effect of that purpose, when a convert is united to the Church in Holy Baptism. Thus S. Paul says to the Ephesians, that God "has predestinated us to the adoption of children," (i. 5,) a passage which will be illustrated by a reference to Gal. iii. 26, 27; and afterwards he speaks of the "mystery of CHRIST, which in other ages was not made known to the sons of men, as it is now revealed unto His holy apostles and prophets by the Spirit, that the Gentiles should be fellow-heirs, and of the same body, and partakers of the promise in CHRIST by the Gospel," (iii. 6.)

Fresh proof might be given of the true meaning of the terms "predestinate" and "elect" from the fact of their being indiscriminately used in reference to all Christians, i.e., all the baptised, and not, as might have been expected were the predestinarian theory true, in reference to a few only: whatever were the privileges of election, they were undoubtedly shared equally by all the baptised, "God has chosen *us* unto salvation," the Apostle himself and *all* the members of the Ephesian Church: he who thus addresses the Thessalonians, "knowing, brethren beloved, *your* election of God," where certainly election, whatever be its meaning, is represented as the privilege of *all* the members of the Thessalonian Church. The usual teaching of Holy Scripture attributing the blessings of predestination and election to *all* the baptised seems to be obviously subversive of the predestinarian or Calvinistic theory. A well known passage at the commencement of Bingham's *Antiquities* amply confirms by the sanction of the primitive Church the view which has been given of the teaching of Holy Scripture. "When Christianity was first planted in the world (says Bingham) they who embraced it were commonly known among themselves by the names of disciples, believers, elect, saints, and brethren before they assumed the title and appellation of Christians;" and afterwards he says the "names *ἅγιοι, πιστοί, ἐκλεκτοί*, saints, believers, elect, &c., occur frequently in ecclesiastical writers, and signify not any select number of Christians (as now the words saint and elect are often used, to signify only the predestinate,) but all Christians in general who were entered into the communion of the Church by the waters of Baptism. For so Theodoret (Com. in Philip. i. 1.)

and others explain the word *ἅγιοι*, saints, to be such as were vouchsafed the honour and privilege of Baptism."

But there are certain passages in S. Paul's Epistles, which appear to teach or imply that the salvation of the righteous is already predetermined and certain; that God will infallibly guide them through the perils of their earthly course, and bring them to His eternal kingdom. Bishop Ellicott seems to intimate that such is the *obvious* meaning of certain passages in S. Paul's Epistles. "Few perversions," the Bishop says, "have been more decided than the change of nominative in Heb. x. 38; yet this ought all the more to urge us on the other side to set an example of candour in the interpretation of *ἵπιτελέσει* in Philip. i. 6, and not to tamper with the tense of *βεβαιώσει*, or the meaning of *ἕως τέλους* in 1 Cor. i. 8."¹

Now the passages from the Epistles of S. Paul, to which the Bishop refers, are a few amongst many others of similar import, in which God is represented as loving His faithful people, watching over them continually, and making the most abundant provision for their final salvation. Were our attention confined to such passages only, we should have every reason to think that the salvation of the righteous was infallibly assured and certain. Thus the Apostle is confident, as in the passage just referred to, that God will perform the good work which He has begun unto the day of JESUS CHRIST, and will confirm the Corinthians unto the end. Just as in another passage, "he is persuaded that neither death nor life, nor angels, nor principalities, nor powers, nor things present, nor height, nor depth, nor any other creature, shall be able to separate us from the love of God which is in CHRIST JESUS our LORD." (Rom. viii. 38, 39.) Now these, and similar passages, by no means imply that all God's faithful people will persevere unto the end, since it is elsewhere stated or implied by the Apostle, that man has free-will and may fall finally from grace. "I sent to know your faith," says S. Paul to the 'elect' Thessalonians, "lest by some means the tempter should have tempted you, and our labour be in vain." And he tells the Corinthians, whom "he was persuaded," as we have already seen, "that God would preserve unto the end," that they are saved if they kept in memory what he preached unto them.

Now unless the teaching of Holy Scripture be contradictory, one set of the passages quoted must be interpreted as harmonising with the other. God's promises of His Almighty protection and unfailing love, are intended to inspire us with confidence in relying upon His guardianship and protection. Amidst trials and dangers we can ever look up with assured confidence to our Heavenly FATHER's love, and plead and depend upon His gra-

¹ "Aids to Faith," p. 425.

cious promises, being confident that neither the strength nor subtlety of men or devils can pluck us out of His hand. On the other side, the need of unceasing care and vigilance are repeatedly set before us. The Apostle, as we know, does not speak with positive assurance even of his own salvation. He "counted not himself to have apprehended;" and feared, "lest after having preached to others himself should be a castaway." And consider his admonition to the Hebrews, he says, that he fears, a "promise having been left them of entering into rest, lest any of them should seem to come short of it," (iv. 1;) and bids them "look diligently lest any man should fail of the grace of God," (xii. 15,) since "the just shall live by faith, but if he draw back my soul shall have no pleasure in him." (x. 38.)

But a new theory on the subject of predestination was proposed a few years ago by Mr. Mozley, which demands a brief notice. He thinks that the doctrine of predestination is expressly taught by S. Paul; and also that the apparently contradictory doctrine of man's free-will is also taught by him in his Epistles, and also in other portions of Holy Scripture—both doctrines he thinks are true and explicitly taught in Scripture, but that we cannot reconcile them, and to ourselves they appear necessarily irreconcilable and discordant. Thus Mr. Mozley says:¹

"Scripture is two-sided on the great question of predestination. If one set of passages, taken in their natural meaning, conveys the doctrine of predestination, another conveys the reverse. The Bible in speaking of mankind, and addressing them on their duties and responsibilities, certainly speaks as if all had the power to do their duty or not when laid before them; nor would any plain man receive any other impression from this language than that the moral being had free-will, and could determine his own acts one way or another. So that sometimes speaking one way and sometimes another, Scripture as a whole makes no assertion, or has no determinate doctrine on this subject." And afterwards, "All intelligible truths, matters of fact for example, are capable of expression, and therefore in the case of such truths explicit statement is necessary, and contradiction is ruinous. But it is not the case that all truth *can* be expressed. . . . Some truths of revealed religion cannot be stated without contradiction to other truths, of which reason or the same revelation informs us, and therefore cannot be stated positively and absolutely without becoming in the very statement false. The truth of absolute predestination cannot be stated without contradiction to the Divine justice and man's free agency. It belongs then to that class of truths which does not admit of statement. It is an imperfect truth, that is a truth imperfectly apprehended by us."

Now we do not deny that Mr. Mozley's theory, considered *per*

¹ "Augustinian Doctrine of Predestination," pp. 38—40.

se, might possibly be satisfactory, and its being a *vid media* between opposite opinions, will recommend it to some persons; our objection to the theory is simply this, that it is wholly uncalled for, as Mr. Mozley has not proved, as we shall show, that the doctrine of absolute predestination is taught in Scripture at all! Indeed, there is hardly any attempt in his work to *prove* the doctrine, as will appear from the following passage, in which our readers will notice how frequently the words "evident," "obvious," &c.,¹ are used, though the writer must have been quite aware that very eminent and learned authors have called in question the truth of the statements he makes, and the interpretation of Holy Scripture which he advocates. He says, "Predestination and election are interpreted to mean predestination or election to privileges or means of grace, which depend on free-will for their cultivation. But this is certainly not the natural sense (!) of the words in Scripture. In the text, (S. Matth. xx. 16,) 'Many are called, but few chosen,' or elect—'elect,' evidently (!) means elect to eternal life itself, and not merely to the opportunity of attaining it. The same may be said of S. Matth. xxiv. 22, 'for the elect's sake those days shall be shortened,' the elect being evidently (!) here the saints, the good, those who will be saved, not those who have been merely admitted into the Christian Church, and the means of obtaining salvation, many of whom being wicked men and enemies of God, God would not for their sakes perform this special act of mercy. On Acts xiii. 48, the remark is obvious, (!) that that to which men are said to be ordained, which is the same as elect, or predestinated,² is expressly eternal life. In Eph. i. 4, 'According as He hath chosen us in Him before the foundation of the world, that we should be holy'—the election is not to the power but to the fact of holiness (!) And the next verse sustains this obvious (!) sense, 'having predestinated us unto the adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto Himself'—adoption always implying in the Epistles sanctity (!) So 2 S. Tim. i. 9, 'Who hath saved us and called us with an holy calling, not according to our own works, but according to His own purpose and grace which was given us in Christ before the world began,' obviously (!) speaks of actual holiness and actual salvation, not the mere opportunity of them as the effect of predestination. And generally it is evident (!) that the terms elect, predestinated, adopted, justified, saints, all refer to the same state and the same class; and that plainly the

¹ We have called, it will be noticed, attention to the passages referred to.

² We cannot admit the truth of this statement. The word translated "ordained," *τεταγμένοι*, means set in order or arranged, as, e.g., soldiers in ranks. Had S. Luke meant "ordained," it cannot be doubted that the word *ὀρίζω*, or *προορίζω*, would have been employed, according to the frequent usage of S. Paul. The meaning of the passage is, they who were in a fit state, prepared or disposed, for eternal life, (through God's heavenly grace, or their own sincerity and freedom from prejudice) believed.

state and class of actually holy men who will certainly be saved as the necessary consequence and reward of such holiness."¹

Again; Mr. Mozley in proof of the doctrine of predestination, has quoted passages from the eighth and ninth chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Thus he says, or rather assumes without proof, that "glorified" (viii. 30,) means, "eternal glory." But even were this the case, it would not prove his doctrine of predestination, but merely imply God's assured intention and design, the eventual result of which would still be dependent upon man's free-will. Such is the ordinary language of Scripture in reference to the subject before us. Thus S. Paul, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, says, "Ye are come unto Mount Zion, the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem." And yet to these Christians who were thus, as it might appear, actually saved, the most awful warnings are addressed showing the danger of apostasy; the clearest intimations are given of the possibility of a final fall from grace. See especially Heb. vi. 4—8; x. 26—31, 38.

But we have no reason to doubt that by "glorified," the Apostle alluded to the privileges of holy Baptism. Such is the interpretation of S. Chrysostom. Even a stronger term, "the saved," is used of the baptised—"By grace are ye (properly, have ye been) saved." "God hath saved us and called us with a holy calling." Besides the word glory is used of Christian privileges in other passages of the New Testament. Thus our LORD, in His last intercessory prayer for the Apostles, says "the glory which Thou gavest Me, have I given them, that they may be one even as We are one;" and S. Paul says, "beholding as in a glass the glory of the LORD, we are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the LORD."

Again; in his comment on the ninth chapter of the Romans, Mr. Mozley especially calls attention to verses 22, 23, "to the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, and the vessels of mercy afore prepared unto glory,"—expressions, he says, which cannot be referred according to the ordinary interpretation, to the grant or refusal of Church privileges. Let this be granted, and still it will by no means follow, that the vessels prepared for glory will all finally be saved. God's intention or design is forcibly intimated, which may or may not be carried to a successful issue; the passage belongs to that class before referred to, which must be interpreted in connexion with the doctrine of man's free-will.

(To be continued.)

¹ Mozley's "Doctrine of Predestination," note 8.

FEMALE BIOGRAPHY.

1. *Biographies of Good Women*. Chiefly by Contributors to the "Monthly Packet." Edited by the Author of "The Heir of Redclyffe." London: Mozley, and Masters.
2. *Holy Women of Old*. By MARY ANNE PARROTT. London: Macintosh.

THERE can be no doubt that healthy and well-written biographies for the youth of both sexes are of great value. Not only does biography fix in the memory, and vivify the events of history, but it has a still higher use in stimulating the ambition, to desire and aim at moral and spiritual excellence. We know as a fact, that some of God's greatest saints have owed their conversion, under Him, to the contemplation of the fruits of grace in His servants, (witness S. Augustine, S. Ignatius Loyola, and others :) and we may be sure that people in all ages need the same stimulant and encouragement. In both the aspects we have indicated, this series of Miss Yonge's is valuable. The subjects of the biographies, with one exception, are very wisely selected, and their histories are written in a pleasant manner. Of Englishwomen we have Mrs. Trimmer, Hannah More, Mrs. Siddons, Dorothy Wordsworth, Sarah Martin, and a few others. The volume also contains a life of La Mère Angélique, Madame Elizabeth, Eugénie de Guérin, Meta Klopstock, Vittoria Colonna, &c. One great end which such a varied selection serves, is the demonstration that there are many phases of goodness. When the sun's light falls on a prism it is broken into different colours, but it is the same light which produces them all; and so God's grace acting on various minds produces developments more unlike each other than are the prismatic colours. And if this is the case with contemporary people, all enjoying the same means of grace, how much more must it be true of persons separated by habits of thought and feeling, and living at different periods of the Church's life. Young people are especially apt to measure everything by a procrustean standard, and indignantly repudiate the idea of allowing any excellence but what tallies with their conception. Therefore it will be good for them to read of the austere nun, and the woman who as an actress served God; of almost the first Sunday-School Teacher, and of Sir Thomas More's saintly daughter; of the devoted worker who has won for herself the words, "I was in prison and ye came unto Me," and of the brilliant and earnest woman whose presumption yet led her even to heresy: to read of these varying minds side by side, and to see that there is no sphere so lowly as to preclude saintliness, and none so lofty as to ensure immunity from temptation.

We are particularly glad to find Hannah More rescued from the supercilious contempt with which she is regarded by many who only know her as the authoress of "Sacred Dramas," and who only know the book from having seen it in company with "A New Week's Preparation," and "The Pilgrim's Progress," on the shelf of some great-aunt, whose judgment therefore rests on rather a slender basis. To read of her as an active and energetic worker in a dark and dreary period of the Church's existence, giving up the ease well earned by a life of unremitting labour, that she might devote her whole power to doing good, will preclude any sentiment of contempt in times to come. And the life of good Mrs. Trimmer is in many respects a similar one. If her literary flights were not so high as those of Hannah More, yet her sphere of practical work was equally extensive; and they were alike in their dutiful adherence to the Church, in a period when she seemed most careless of her children's love.

The one Biography to which we take exception is that of Mrs. Leadbeater. We certainly cannot rightly hold up to young people as a model, an unbaptized woman, however consistent and religious her life, out of CHRIST, may have appeared. We forget whether the first series of these Biographies consisted only of Churchwomen; the present volume contains some—as Sarah Martin—whose religion was largely tinged with Methodism, but no Englishwoman, save Mrs. Leadbeater, who was not in communion with CHRIST's Church. If an exception was to be made to this rule, the choice of Quakers for whom to make it is unfortunate.

The almost entire absence of direct religious teaching is a characteristic mark of the present work, in common with most of Miss Yonge's publications, and in this respect, the other book we have to notice presents a complete contrast to it.

"Holy Women of Old" takes its subjects from the Bible—with three or four exceptions from the Old Testament—and is intended primarily for Mothers' Meetings, and therefore the characters are chiefly regarded in their maternal aspect. But it will also be found useful for Sunday Schools, Lending Libraries, Night Schools, &c. It is full of careful moral teaching, and is for the most part reliable in its interpretations of Scripture events.

Rebekah as usual is a rock upon which the authoress splits, though she seems to be groping after the Catholic view of that difficult portion of history, and we strongly advise her, before issuing another edition, to read up the old commentators on the subject.

We miss any high spiritual teaching, but no doubt the class for which the book is intended will benefit more from moral lessons than from spiritual interpretations, so long as the basis on which the lessons rest is sound and true. Uneducated people are unable

to comprehend anything which requires reason or deduction, and we must provide for them clear and straightforward sermonizing: while Miss Yonge's writings, intended mainly for educated people, leave the readers to use their own judgment and to draw their own lessons.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *The Revival of Lay Orders in the Church of England. A Lecture delivered to the Members of the Manchester Church Institute, Nov. 14, 1865.* By the Rev. J. M. ELVY, M.A., Curate of the Cathedral District. London: Whittaker and Co.
2. *Revival of the Sub-Diaconate. A Plea for the extension of the Ministerial Office. A Letter to the Right Hon. and Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of London.* By WILLIAM BAIRD, M.A., Missionary Curate of S. Gabriel's District, Bromley. London: Rivingtons.

THESE two pamphlets, together with the prospectus of a society which has appeared for carrying out the plans here sketched, seem to show that the subject of the extension of the ministerial office is now becoming ripe for legislation. In reviewing Archdeacon Hale's Charge about a year ago, we expressed our conviction that the wants of the Church, which are now so generally acknowledged, might be met to a very great degree, and with most beneficial reaction upon the laity, by the revival of the order of Reader, to be held by persons after episcopal examination and benediction, who could still retain their ordinary secular occupations, and who would therefore require no salary, and so could not be confounded with those in the Church's higher orders. Mr. Elvy's title of "Lay Orders" is of course a misnomer, and perhaps there is a little unconscious exaggeration in his account of the existing destitution. Statistics are notoriously misleading; and it is a mistake to say that London is in a worse condition than it was when the "Metropolitan Churches Fund," and the "Additional Curates Society," were begun. The old parishes are in a much better condition than they were; and while the population has rather decreased than increased, S. James Westminster, S. Anne, S. Martin, S. Andrew Holborn, S. Margaret Westminster, Shoreditch, S. George in the East, and in fact all the central parishes have had one, two, or three additional churches built in them. It is by including the suburban districts, which are hardly to be regarded as settled population in the general name of London, that the fallacy originates. Nevertheless the facts are sufficiently appalling, and we thank the author very heartily for his pamphlet, and hope that together with Mr. Baird's less exhaustive one it may gain a wide circulation.

Oswald, the Young Artist. A Tale for Boys. London: J. T. Hayes.

GOOD practical tales for boys are scarce. Lads instinctively rebel against softness and sentiment, and for this reason it is far more difficult to reach a boy's heart than a girl's. The author has succeeded in giving us a tale of highly religious and moral tone, Catholic in its doctrine and fervent in language, calculated to rouse a boy's sense of honour, and to encourage high-souled acts of self-discipline. Moral courage and Catholic privileges are made really attractive, instead of the conceit and self-concentration, falsely called manliness and courage, which are often set forward as examples to boys.

A Handbook of Floral Decorations for Churches. By Mr. EDWARD W. GODWIN, Architect. London: Masters. Bristol: H. W. Drake.

A YEAR ago, at this season, we laid down certain principles of Church Festival Decorations, in an article on the subject, especially suggesting the employment of other decorative materials as well as flowers, and more attention to ritualism in detail. These principles have been more successfully reduced to a system in the present work, than in any previous manual. The following extract from the preface will show the author's aim:

"It cannot be too strongly urged upon those who have the ordering of our churches, that floral decoration may be, and too often is, used in excess. I am convinced that the use of other means of decoration, such as coloured fabric, banners, appliqué work, and painted cloths or boards—limiting the use of flowers to places where vases might stand—would be better in every way, and would save us the disagreeable sight which churches too often present of drooping branch and shrivelled leaf. In the following pages floral decoration, as now practised, is fully recognized and dealt with; but those who can trust themselves to hang up banners, embroidered cloths, tapestry work, and, indeed, all kinds of art—who can thus show forth their joy without endangering their faith, need scarcely be told that flowers and leaves are not quite the beginning and the end of festival decorations."

The book has three chapters of useful practical information, illustrated by forty-four figures, and is marvellously cheap, being published at a shilling.

Hymns and other Poems. By WILLIAM BRIGHT, M.A. London: Rivingtons.

THIS volume is the production of a poetical mind, and those who have read Mr. Bright's prose writings will not need to be told that a devout and Catholic spirit pervades it. The Eucharistic hymns are particularly good; and there is considerable life and spirit in some of the narrative poems,—e.g., "The Battle of Varna" and "A Tradition of Culloden,"—which occur at the end of the volume.

Echoes of our Childhood. London: Masters.

WE do not know when we have seen a more charming book than this. The verses are really poetical, and will be read with pleasure by many who have left childhood far behind. They remind us a little of Jane Taylor's "Original Poems," which amused the nurseries of twenty years ago; but they are very far superior to Miss Taylor's verses, and the spirited illustrations and handsome type make the work as pretty a Christmas present as any child can desire.

We have to notice some considerable changes in our "Monthlies." The two first are not encouraging to booksellers. Mr. Parker gives up his connection as editor and publisher of the *Gentleman's Magazine*, which will henceforward be continued by Messrs. Bradbury and Evans. The *Englishman*, after a year's trial by Messrs. Rivington, has come to an end. The *Monthly Packet* is turned into an 8vo. at a shilling, and we suppose will be more miscellaneous than ever in its character. The *Churchman's Companion* shows evident signs of increased life and energy. The *Penny Post*, the *Parochial Magazine*, *Magazine for the Young*, the *Church of the People*, and *Pleasant Hours*, also maintain their place as established favourites. The *Scottish Ecclesiastical Gazette* has now fallen into new and good hands.

We are glad to find that a second edition of Mr. BENNETT's *Advent Readings from the Fathers* (Parker) has been called for.

Mr. Parker has published the third volume of *Johnson's Lives of the Poets*, in his very handy series of "English Classics."

The third volume of Dr. WORDSWORTH'S *Old Testament* (Rivingtons) has just appeared, containing the notes on Joshua, Judges, and Ruth. We hope to commence our review of this valuable work in our next Number.

A Manual of the Te Deum (Mozleys) deserves the same commendation as that on the Litany before published, and is open to the same objections.

"*Every Eye shall see Him*," and "*The Word was made Flesh*," (Macintosh,) are two tracts by a writer already known for a plain and simple style, and indicate an increasing appreciation of the Church's seasons.

We have only time just to acknowledge the concluding volume of the *Old Testament Scriptures*, (Whitfield, Green, and Co.,) by Mr. SHARPE. The division of the volume is rather inconvenient, half of "the Devotional Books" being joined with the Historical, and half with the Prophetical.

Fragments from the Life of a Motherless Child, (Masters,) though in appearance only a child's book, is full of deep views concerning the social requirements of the age, and of the duty of the Church in reference to them. It is effectively written, and will do good.

On the principle that servants and children should not "think," a writer of some promise has published an amusing and well-principled tale, called *Thinking for Oneself*, (Masters,) in which two children exemplify very sufficiently the truth of the old adage, by falling into a number of self-induced troubles, as the result of their unwillingness to be guided by their elders. The lesson is certainly not without its value.

Mr. WHARTON MARRIOTT has published a second part of his *Ειρηνικά*, (Rivingtons,) in which he treats the subject of "Regeneration and Conversion." One may quite hope that efforts of this kind will do good; but we cannot advise the writer to look for any immediate results.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW EDITION OF SANCTA CLARA.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—You are quite right in saying that Sancta Clara ought to have been edited by a good patristic scholar, who would have been at the pains to verify the references. I was startled, like yourself, by the authority of S. Augustine being claimed for the Immaculate Conception of S. Mary. On referring to that Father, I find that the author of the new Roman doctrine was not S. Augustine but the heretic Pelagius, who, it is well known, denied altogether the tenet of "original sin." And what is S. Augustine's reply? Just that of any reverent mind. He declined altogether to enter upon the question of S. Mary's nature, because it was foreign to the point at issue. But S. Augustine really dis-
countenances the view, and suggests as the probable cause of her holiness, that she had a special measure of grace given, "ad vincendum omni ex parte peccatum." (*De naturâ et gratiâ*, c. 42, Tom. x., p. 144.)

I am, &c.

M. A.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

MR. Oxenham has sent us a courteous reply to the defence of our reviewer. We have not space, however, for its insertion; and, in a matter where he admits that there are two views allowable, it is scarcely worth while to continue controversy.

MOZLEY'S BAMPTON LECTURES.

Eight Lectures on Miracles, preached before the University of Oxford, in the year 1865, on the foundation of the late Rev. John Bampton, Canon of Salisbury. By J. B. MOZLEY, B.D., Vicar of Shoreham, late Fellow of Magdalen College. London: Rivingtons.

THIS is a very able and a very seasonable book ; and we proceed at once to give our readers a sketch of its contents, in the hope of inducing them to consult for themselves its thoughtful and interesting pages. The question of miracles is once again occupying a prominent place in controversy, though in a form different from that in which Hume presented it. Hume did not deny the possibility of a miracle. He rested the question on a comparison of probabilities—it being, in his opinion, more probable that testimony should be false than that miracles should be true, and therefore more consonant with right reason to disbelieve the report of a miracle rather than the general testimony of mankind in favour of the stability of the present order of nature. Hume was one of the acutest of dialecticians and one of the most skilful of sophists, and his essay on miracles is a masterpiece of ingenious fallacies ; but the fallacies are so dexterously manipulated that they look like a sound and unbroken chain of reasoning. Not till the argument is examined closely do the numerous flaws in the links appear ; and then the chain, which looked so perfect in the hands of the juggler, falls to pieces on the ground. What can be more contrary to the experience of the inhabitants of regions which enjoy perpetual summer than the phenomenon of *ice* ? According to Hume's argument, an inhabitant of Polynesia ought to disbelieve all the people of All the Russias making solemn affidavit that the water of some seas and rivers becomes solid for months together, that horse-races take place on its surface as on dry ground ; and that it is in some parts so smooth that boats in full sail and resting on iron skates can skim along at the rate of sixty miles an hour. The argument from experience would compel the Polynesian to remand such tales to the realms of fiction. To him they would contradict the order of nature and the testimony of experience quite as much as the resurrection of a man from the dead. Yet in rejecting them he would be rejecting facts.

Again ; Hume was not professedly an atheist ; but his argument leads to an atheistical conclusion. For if no amount of testimony can suffice to establish any interruption of the order of nature, that order must be eternal, and there was, and could be, no such thing as creation ; which is atheism ; for the idea of God implies the idea of a *first cause, and that implies a Creator.*

VOL. XXVIII.—FEBRUARY, 1866.

H

Nor is it the theologian alone who will suffer from Hume's argument. Let the geologist look to it; for if the present order of nature is eternal (and that is the logical issue of the argument from experience,) what becomes of his geological periods, which were successive innovations on the previous order of nature,—the order of nature, which we now behold, being but of yesterday? Darwin, too, must either slay Hume's argument, or be slain by it. For if the argument from experience is correct, the theory of spontaneous development is an impossibility. If, on the other hand, the development theory is correct, the argument from experience has received its death-blow. For the first ape that developed itself into a man would cover with confusion the experience of all the generations of apes which went before it, while it would, at the same time, reduce to a *reductio ad absurdum* the experience of its own human offspring, the last chain in that experience terminating in the strange contradiction of all previous experience—a baboon!

The opponents of miracles in the present day evidently see that Hume's position is self-destructive; he cannot pull down the edifice of his opponents without burying himself and his friends in the ruins. The ground of attack is, therefore, shifted. Hume's argument is handled and leant against, *in terrorem*, whenever an opportunity offers, but the attack on miracles is now mainly rested on their inherent impossibility. Miracles are violations or suspensions of the laws of nature, and that is said to be impossible. It is to this class of objectors that Mr. Mozley addresses himself, and his opponents themselves must feel that he has made some ugly breaches along their ramparts.

In the first Lecture Mr. Mozley sets himself to prove the necessity of miracles in support of a Divine revelation. The recent intellectual movement against miracles Mr. Mozley traces partly to the advance of science, which helps to withdraw men's minds from moral grounds and fix them on physical laws; and partly to the influence of what he calls "the historical imagination."

"By the historical imagination I mean the habit of realising past time, of putting history before ourselves in such a light that the persons and events figuring in it are seen as once-living persons and once-present events. This is in itself a high and valuable power, and it is evident that there is too little of it in the mass of men, to whom the past is a figured surface rather than an actual extension backwards of time, in which the actors had all the feelings of the hour and saw it passing by them as we do,—the men who were then living in the world, the men of the day. The past is an inanimate image to their minds, which does not beat with the pulse of life. And this want of reality attaching to the time, certain occurrences in it do not raise the questionings, which those very occurrences realized would raise. But a more powerful imagination enables a man in some way to realise the past, and to see in it the ever-living present; so that when he comes across any scene of history he can bring it home to himself that this scene was

once present, that this was the then living world. But when the reality of the past is once apprehended and embraced, then the miraculous occurrences in it are realised too: being realised, they excite surprise; and surprise, when it once comes in, takes two directions; it either makes belief more real, or it destroys belief. There is an element of doubt in surprise; for this emotion arises *because* an event is strange; and an event is strange because it goes counter to and jars with presumption. Shall surprise then give life to belief, or stimulus to doubt? The road of belief and unbelief in the history of some minds thus partly lies over common ground; the two go part of their journey together; they have a common perception in the insight into the real astonishing nature of the facts with which they deal. The majority of mankind perhaps owe their belief rather to the outward influence of custom and education than to any strong principle of faith within; and it is to be feared that many, if they came to perceive how wonderful what they believed was, would not find their belief so easy and so matter-of-course a thing as they appear to find it. Custom throws a film over the great facts of religion, and interposes a veil between the mind and truth, which, by preventing wonder, intercepts doubt too, and at the same time excludes from deep belief and protects from disbelief. But deeper faith and disbelief throw off in common the dependence on mere custom, draw aside the interposing veil, place themselves face to face with the contents of the past, and expose themselves alike to the ordeal of wonder."

But a mind gifted with this historical imagination is apt to fall into the error of confounding the picture which the imagination has drawn with the reality. The miraculous events recorded in the Bible are divested of their supernatural character, and imagined as purely natural phenomena which the men of that time, in the absence of scientific knowledge, ascribed to supernatural agency. In other words, while the sceptic is supposing that he is faithfully reproducing the times and circumstances of which he writes, he is merely projecting the events and influences of his own age onwards to the age of our Lord and His Apostles; just as great painters portray our Lord from living models, filling up the pictures by accessories drawn from the Bible history.

"It seems to him as if he could bring back a report from thence, and assure us that nothing really took place in that world of the nature that we suppose. But in truth he no more knows by this process of the imagination what took place in that world than another person knows: for we cannot in this way ascertain facts. The imagination assumes knowledge, and does not make it: it verifies the stock we have, but does not add one item to it. . . . That world has now passed away, and cannot be recalled. But certain things are said to have taken place in it. Whether those events did take place or not must depend on the testimony which has come down to us."

But many persons, without denying the abstract possibility of a miracle, deny that miracles are necessary by way of guarantee to

revelation. To several objections of this class Mr. Mozley supplies answers.

"A revelation is, properly speaking, such only by virtue of telling us something which we could not know without it. But how do we know that that communication of what is undiscoverable by human reason is true? Our reason cannot prove the truth of it, for it is by the very supposition beyond our reason. There must be, then, some note or sign to certify to it and distinguish it as a true communication from God, which note can be nothing else than a miracle."

This is the thesis to the exposition of which the first lecture is devoted.

The second Lecture is on the "Order of Nature," and is exceedingly interesting as well as able. Mr. Mozley begins with the pertinent question, "What is meant by the order of nature?" "It will be answered, That succession and recurrence of physical events of which we have had experience." But this definition, true as far as it goes, omits the main point. "For that order of nature which we assume in all our purposes and aims in life is not a past, but a future." In short, Hume's argument from our alleged experience as to the uniformity of natural laws breaks down on the very threshold of the inquiry. We have *no experience* of the future, and have *no reason*—only a presumption or feeling, which may be true or false—that the future will be like the past. The influence of the material world exercises such a tyranny over us that we have a sort of instinctive feeling that the future *must* be a repetition of the past; we regard it in the nature of an axiom, a truth so self-evident as to supersede the necessity of proof. But this is plainly a delusion. A self-evident fact is that of which the opposite is the contradictory; "but though the fact that the sun rose to-day would be contradicted by the fact that it did not rise to-day, it is in no way contradicted by the fact that it will not rise to-morrow. These two facts are quite consistent with each other." Mr. Mozley is, no doubt, correct in saying that "when we examine the different reasons which may be assigned for this connection, i.e., for this belief that the future will be like the past, they will all come at last to be mere statements of the belief itself, and not reason to account for it." Men speak of physical causes; but the truth is that we know nothing of causes in nature, in the proper sense of the word cause. Of course, the Christian believes in a supernatural Cause working in nature, but that belief he has obtained from a source outside of nature. Physical science only tells us of recurring sequences. It knows nothing of a permanent cause guaranteeing the perpetuity or constancy of such sequences.

"Let us imagine the occurrence of a particular physical phenomenon for the first time. Upon that single occurrence we should have but the

very faintest expectation of another. If it did occur again once or twice, so far from counting on another recurrence, a cessation would come as the more natural event to us. But let it occur a hundred times, and we should feel no hesitation in inviting persons from a distance to see it; and if it occurred every day for years, its recurrence would then be a certainty to us, its cessation a marvel. But what has taken place in the interim to produce this total change in our belief? From the mere repetition do we know anything more about its cause? No. Then what have we got besides the past repetition itself? Nothing. Why then are we so certain of its *future* repetition? All we can say is that the unknown casts its shadows before; we project into unborn time the existing types, and the secret skill of nature intercepts the darkness of the future by ever suspending before our eyes, as it were in a mirror, a reflexion of the past. We really look at a blank before us, but the mind full of the scene behind, sees it again in front."

Even Hume himself, when not engaged in defending a theory, acknowledged that the popular belief in the order of nature was not based on reason but on instinct, and that the argument from experience is no argument at all. "I have found," he says in his *Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding*,

"that such and such an object has always been attended with such an effect, and I foresee that other objects which are in appearance similar will be attended with similar effects. I shall allow, if you please, that the one proposition may justly be inferred from the other: I know in fact that it always is inferred: but if you insist that the inference is made by a chain of reasoning, I desire you to produce that reasoning. The connection between these propositions is not intuitive. There is required a medium which may enable the mind to draw such an inference, if, indeed, it can be drawn by reasoning and argument. What that medium is I must confess passes my comprehension. I cannot find, I cannot imagine any such reasoning. You say that the one proposition is an inference from the other; but you must confess that the inference is not intuitive, neither is it demonstrative. Of what nature is it then? To say it is experimental is begging the question. For all inferences from experience *suppose* as their foundation that the future will be like the past: it is impossible therefore that any argument from experience can prove the resemblance. Let the course of things be allowed hitherto ever so regular, that alone, without some new argument or inference, proves not that for the future it will continue so. As an agent I am quite satisfied on the point, but as a philosopher I want to learn the foundation of this inference. No reading, no inquiry has yet been able to remove my difficulty."

And even in the *Essay on Miracles* Hume argues that the tokens of decay and dissolution in the world around us afford probable evidence for the termination of the present order of nature. Yet the end of the world would be as great a miracle as its beginning, and greater, measured by a human standard, than the class of miracles against which Hume wrote his essay; and not only so,

but the argument from experience in favour of the continuance of the order of nature would reach the maximum of its force the very moment before that order came to an end. So that, as Mr. Mozley truly remarks, "the argument from mere experience intrinsically differs in the quality of reasoning, not only from mathematical reasoning, but even from the other great department of *probable* reasoning." Even the brutes share with man this belief in the uniformity of nature, as their habits clearly show; a fact which, of itself, is sufficient to prove that the belief is not founded on reason, or in Hume's stronger language, "that experimental reasoning itself, which we possess in common with beasts, is nothing but a species of instinct or mechanical power that acts in us unknown to ourselves."

"And now," to quote Mr. Mozley, "the belief in the order of nature being thus, however powerful and useful, an unintelligent impulse, of which we can give no rational account, in what way does this discovery affect the question of miracles? In this way: that this belief not having itself its foundation in reason, the ground is gone upon which it could be maintained that miracles as opposed to the order of nature were opposed to reason."

Mr. Mozley devotes the remainder of this lecture to an examination of what is called the inductive principle, which he shows us to be really nothing more than a high-sounding name for that instinctive impulse already spoken of, which induces us to infer a certain conclusion from premisses with which the conclusion has no manner of connection. Inductive reasoning is, properly speaking, no reasoning at all:—

"It is called so because an inference is made in it, a general conclusion is drawn from particulars. But the first part of the inductive process is not reasoning but observation; the second part is not reasoning but instinct: the scientific part is not inductive, the inductive part is not scientific. Hence we cannot attribute to scientific men, by however penetrating and lofty faculties they may have discovered *facts*, any peculiar perception of recurrence of *law*. Language has been used as if science generated a perception of mathematical or necessary sequence in the order of nature. But science has herself proclaimed the truth, that there is *no* necessary connection in nature; nor has science to do with generalisation at all, but only with discovery. And, I may add, that though science avails herself of the inductive principle, and depends for all her utility upon it, still to ascertain the nature of this principle is not the province of physical but of mental science."

Mr. Mozley points out that "the order of nature" is an equivocal phrase, being used sometimes in the sense of orderly arrangement, sometimes in that of recurrence. It is in the latter sense only that a miracle interrupts it. Our space will not admit of our entering

more fully into Mr. Mozley's exposition of the inductive process, but we will give his conclusion in his own words.

"The scientific part of induction being only the pursuit of a particular fact, miracles cannot in the nature of the case receive any blow from the scientific part of induction; because the existence of one fact does not interfere with the existence of another dissimilar fact. That which *does* resist the miraculous is the *unscientific* part of induction, or the instinctive generalization upon this fact. The inductive principle being that which assimilates the known to the unknown, or establishes the order of nature, is opposed to any dissimilar fact or interruption of that order, whether we think of it as going to be, or whether we think of it as having by report taken place. A reported miracle is a reported case, in which the order of nature did not for that instance continue, but was interrupted. The inductive principle, therefore, resists that miracle. But what is the inductive principle? What is its nature? What is its force? What is its weight upon such a question? The inductive principle is simply the mechanical expectation of the likeness of the unknown to the known; not become any more luminous than it was before because its subject-matter is higher, but being in the most vulgar and the most scientific material alike unreasoning, i.e., no part of the distinctive reason of man. When, then, there is nothing on the side of reason opposed to it, as is the case commonly, we follow it absolutely. But supposing there should arise a call of reason to us to believe what is opposite to it; supposing there is the evidence of testimony, which is an appeal to our proper reason, that an event has taken place which is opposed to this impression, it is evident then that our reason must prevail in the encounter, i.e., that if there is on one side *positive* evidence, the antecedent counter expectation of instinct must give way

"The proper function of the inductive principle, the argument from experience, or the belief in the order of nature—by whatever phrase we designate the same instinct—is to operate as a practical basis for the affairs of life, and the carrying on of human society. Without it, it would be impossible for the world to go on, because without it we should have no future before us to calculate upon; we should not feel any assurance of the continuance of the world from moment to moment."

The belief in the constancy of nature, therefore, has a high moral value; but it is *ultra crepidam* when it begins to issue laws and ordinances for the guidance of the reason. "It does not belong to this principle to lay down speculative positions, and to say what can or cannot take place in the world. It does not belong to it to control religious belief, or to determine that certain acts of God for the revelation of His will to man, reported to have taken place, have not taken place. Such decisions are totally out of its sphere." In short, the inductive principle, as an argument against miracles, is "a fiction, not a truth; a weapon of air, which even in the hand of a giant can inflict no blow, because it is itself a

shadow. The object of assault receives the thrust without a shock, only exposing the want of solidity in the implement of war. The battle against the supernatural has been going on long, and strong men have conducted it, and are conducting it; but what they want is a weapon. The logic of unbelief wants a universal, but no universal is forthcoming, and it only wastes its strength in wielding a fictitious one."

The third Lecture examines the influence of the imagination on belief. Mr. Mozley marks an important distinction between the imagination as it energizes actively, and as it receives impressions passively. In the former case it is a valuable instrument of man's moral and intellectual nature; in the latter it is an imperfection and a weakness of nature. Physical philosophers sometimes characterize the belief in the supernatural as a delusion of the imagination, when the reproach in fact tells with much greater force against their own creed as to the immutability of the order of nature. "Materialism itself is the result of imagination, which is so impressed by matter that it cannot realise the existence of spirit."

Mr. Mozley also corrects a very common and a very mischievous plea which is frequently urged on behalf of the sceptic. How often do we read in books and hear in conversation that belief is a matter of the intellect, and that a man is not responsible for his intellectual opinions. Of course, it is not true that belief in matters of religion is purely intellectual; it has a moral element, for it pertains to the will and the conscience. Man is a complex being. His nature is a constitution, being made up of a great variety of capacities and energies which are always acting and reacting on each other, and cannot act at all without this mutual influence. It is evident, therefore, that the intellect is biassed in one direction or another by the reflex action of the other powers of man's nature, and especially of his moral and religious propensities; it contracts good or bad habits according as the will with which it is united is strong or weak in moral purpose. To take the case which Mr. Mozley puts:

"If then, when there is no producible reason why a miracle should be impossible, a person appears to himself to believe that it is; if the intellect is so bound to the order of nature that it rejects by an instantaneous impulse a fact of a contrary type, it can only be because the intellect has contracted an unsound habit upon that subject-matter."

The fourth Lecture contains some very useful reflections on man's belief in a God. It is a belief which is incapable alike of proof and disproof. All that can be said is that disbelief in God involves not only contradictions but absurdities, while belief in Him involves only contradictions, or rather antinomies of the pure reason, as Kant would express it. The idea of God is so vast that

the finite mind cannot embrace it. It can only take in "here a little and there a little" at a time. Its range of vision is too limited to reach the point where the opposing statements meet in harmony; the cloud receives it out of our sight, as it received their vanishing LORD from the longing gaze of His disciples on Mount Olivet.

Now, of course, the argument of miracles starts with an assumption—belief in God. The argument against miracles starts also with an assumption,—unbelief in God. The unbelief is not always, perhaps not often, consciously entertained; but it is certainly latent in the mind; for without it the argument against miracles has no standing-ground in philosophy. If there is a God, miracles are not only possible, but probable. They are possible, for the Almighty can do all things which involve no contradiction of His attributes, and miracles do not. They are probable, for their end is the good of man; and "it can argue no inconstancy in the Divine will to institute an order of nature for one purpose, and suspend it for another." Miracles are, in fact, the correlative of free-will. Even man can counteract the order of nature by the exercise of a power above and independent, in its degree, of natural laws; *à fortiori*, God can do so.

The fifth Lecture discusses the ingredients and limitations necessary to constitute valid testimony; the sixth Lecture gives reasons for concluding that Miracles, though violations, apparently, of the laws of nature, may really be the effect of unknown law; the seventh considers miracles in their practical result; and the last Lecture is devoted to the difficult task, so often attempted and so frequently unsuccessful, of discriminating between true and false miracles. No doubt criteria may be given which shall separate a large class of false miracles from the true; but the attempt to draw a clear line of demarcation between the miracles of the Bible and the ecclesiastical miracles, as they are called, has always been a failure; and we cannot say that Mr. Mozley has been more successful than his predecessors. For instance, Mr. Mozley insists on the objection to ecclesiastical miracles on the ground of their maintaining throughout a uniform low level in contrast with the high standard of the miracles of Scripture. This may be admitted with qualifications; such as the portents which heralded the fall of Jerusalem, the miraculous interruption of Julian's profane attempt to rebuild the temple, the sign of the cross promising victory to Constantine. But if the ecclesiastical miracles, as a body, wear an ambiguous aspect, being cures, visions, exorcisms, and the like, the same remark applies to a majority of the Gospel miracles. Mr. Mozley is too acute to have overlooked this objection; he acknowledges it, and seeks to evade its force by an argument which is equally valid in support of the ecclesiastical miracles. "The objection," he says, "does not affect

the Gospel miracles as a body, because we judge of the body or whole, from its highest specimens, not from its lowest." Quite so; but by what rule of justice or reasoning are the ecclesiastical miracles to be excluded from the benefit of that admission? They, too, have their "highest specimens," as well as their "lowest." Moreover, has not our LORD promised "the highest specimens" equally with "the lowest" as the reward of faith in *all* ages; and what right have we to draw an arbitrary line, and say to the miraculous power of God, energising through His Church, "hitherto shalt thou come, and no farther?" Even the Apostles could not work miracles at all times. S. Paul underwent the perils of shipwreck, of robbers, and of persecutors, like an ordinary missionary, and he had to endure the agony of suspense by the sick-bed of friends "nigh unto death."

Again, Mr. Mozley draws a distinction, which is purely arbitrary, between the thaumaturgy of the Apostolic era, and that of later times. In the former case, he says that the attempt to work miracles was always successful; in the latter, not so. It is not quite clear whether he means that in the Apostolic age all who tried to work miracles effected their purpose; whereas in the case of ecclesiastical miracles a few only, of the multitudes who attempted, succeeded: or that the workers of the Bible miracles never failed in the attempt, while those of a later period sometimes did. In either case, the distinction cannot be sustained. It starts with the assumption that the sacred volume contains all the attempts made to work miracles. How do we know that there were no unsuccessful attempts made which have not been recorded? There are several indications of such attempts, and one is incidentally mentioned,—the failure of the Apostles, apparently during the very period when they were specially commissioned to work such miracles, to cast out the deaf and dumb spirit. And did not S. Peter in attempting to walk on the sea, "begin to sink?"

"Again," says Mr. Mozley, "there is a wildness, a puerile extravagance, a grotesqueness, and an absurdity in the type (of certain ecclesiastical miracles) such as to disqualify them for being a subject of evidence. The sense of what is absurd, ridiculous, and therefore impossible as an act of God, is part of our moral nature: and if a miracle even seen with our own eyes cannot force us to accept anything contrary to morality or a fundamental truth of religion, still less can professed evidence force us to believe in Divine acts, which are upon the face of them unworthy of the Divine authorship."

A dangerous argument in the hands of a Christian apologist, and a *petitio principii* into the bargain. By a parity of reasoning Mr. Mozley must surrender to the infidel scoffer the story of the serpent tempting Eve, of Moses' rod turned into a serpent and eating up those of the Egyptian magicians, of two she-bears

devouring forty and two children who had been cursed by Elisha for calling him "bald head," of the prophet sending his stick for the restoration of the dead child, of Balaam's ass speaking with a man's voice, of Jonah swallowed by the whale, of the devils entering the swine and driving them into the sea. To the infidel who should characterize these miracles as "contrary to morality or fundamental truths of religion," and "unworthy of the Divine Authorship," Mr. Mozley would reply that the assertion was a begging of the whole question; and that is our reply to himself. Mr. Mozley foresaw this retort, and he attempts to parry it with the remark that "quantity and degree make all the difference between what is impressive and what is puerile, what is weighty and what is absurd." And he goes on to contrast the sparse quantity of the Scripture miracles with the profusion of the ecclesiastical.

But is it true that an absurdity becomes less absurd by being multiplied? Does an "impressive" fact become of necessity "puerile" by being repeated? or a "weighty" fact "absurd" by the same process? If it is ridiculous to hear half a dozen asses speaking, is it, by way of consequence, impressive to hear one ass speak? Quantity and degree may make a difference in the *intensity* of the impressions which they excite, but they can make no difference in the *quality*. Then as to the contrast between the quantity of the Scripture and Ecclesiastical miracles; it is easy to say in reply that Holy Scripture contains but a selection, and that a small one, of contemporary miracles. S. John tells us so expressly with respect to our Lord's miracles; and it is, no doubt, equally true, though of course in a far less degree of other miracles. The Apocryphal Gospels record many strange and uncouth miracles; and if these reflect no discredit on those related by the Evangelists, why should the grotesque legends of Mediæval writers destroy the credibility of other classes of miracles which are consonant with man's moral and religious instincts? Surely it is ever the lot of truth to be simulated by counterfeits, of the good seed to be interspersed with tares. If the Church is what we believe her to be, a supernatural institution, inheriting divine gifts, and wielding divine powers, it cannot be contrary to Christian feeling or right reason to believe that miracles must ever remain in the armoury of her weapons while she is militant on earth. Dominion over nature is easier of achievement than dominion over men's rebellious wills; and all Christians admit the continuance of the latter kind of miracle. Our Blessed Lord placed no limitation on the gift of working miracles in the Christian Church except the weakness of man's faith, and we should be careful not to invent limitations of our own.

On the whole, however, Mr. Mozley's book is able and valuable, and we can cordially recommend it to our readers.

MODERN PREACHING.

Some Words for God : being Sermons Preached before the University of Oxford, chiefly during the years 1863—1865. By HENRY PARRY LIDDON, M.A., Student of Christ Church, Prebendary of Salisbury, Examining Chaplain to the Bishop of Salisbury, and lately Select Preacher. Rivingtons : Oxford and London.
Report of the Proceedings of the Church Congress, held at Bristol, Oct. 11, 12, 13, 1864.
Guardian, Oct. 1865.

THE newspapers have resounded of late with the popular cry of the poverty of our pulpit eloquence. It has really been, we believe, a part of the crusade against all sacred things which is the characteristic feature of the age. And yet "Habitans in sicco" and his fellows made a tacit admission which they had no intention of making; they have acknowledged that if every member of the bar or the senate were compelled to make an oration twice a week, and they had been compelled to listen, the orations of the large majority would have been found as dry and tedious as the sermons of the clergy.

Viewed as a question of mere eloquence, the clerical order may boast of orators who can rivet the attention of their audience as well as the bar or the senate. In this view there is no reason to expect that all the clergy should possess the eloquence of such men as Melvill or Wilberforce, Liddon or Woodford, any more than that every member of the House of Commons should be equal to Gladstone or D'Israeli in debate. The Church can boast of as many real orators as other professions. But the preacher *must* be heard, whatever may be the measure of his gifts, whilst at the bar the dull orator has seldom an opportunity of displaying his dullness, and the tedious speech of many a member of the House of Commons would be delivered to an empty house, or to the reporters in the gallery. Eloquence is not expected of the majority of the members of any other profession, and why should it be demanded of the clergy? We reply that the outcry arose from an instinctive feeling that the preacher's theme was such as ought to inspire eloquence. It was in reality not the pitting of one profession against another, but the conviction, which underlay the complaint, that the things which concern our salvation are infinitely higher than the details of a budget, or the commercial advantages of a projected railway. On any other supposition the complaint was simply absurd, for not only does the number of eloquent sermons delivered in the course of the year far exceed the speeches which attract attention at Westminster

Hall or S. Stephen's, but there has been no time since the Reformation when the preaching of the English clergy has been as popular as at the present. If "Habitans in sicco" heard a peculiarly dull sermon, he would probably say that the preacher had treated him to one of his grandfather's discourses.

We have all heard elderly clergymen tell odd stories of malapropos sermons which they have preached or heard in the days of their youth. One has told us of his father's Visitation sermon which he preached *totidem verbis*—"My reverend brethren"—and all, to a country congregation of the most bucolic type. Another has related how he borrowed from a friend what was supposed to be a club sermon, which, being written in a most legible hand, did not require a previous perusal, but when he got into the middle of his discourse he found to his dismay that, instead of being a club sermon, it was an eleemosynary appeal on behalf of the widows and orphans of the sailors who were killed at the battle of Trafalgar. Others have told us of the same sermon being preached on the same day by vicar and curate to the same congregation, and it is very probable that some amongst the audience did not discover the blunder. We have also known clergymen, who simply out of humility never preached their own sermons. No doubt the sermons in themselves were better than they could have themselves composed, but we must remind those who would perpetuate the custom of a story told by Dr. Johnson, of a clergyman who, having listened to a very effective sermon preached by a friend, borrowed it for the edification of his own congregation, but, finding that it produced no effect upon them, complained to the author of the failure; "You borrowed my fiddle," was the reply, "but not my fiddlestick." The most perfect sermon is ineffective without that earnestness of manner which proves that the preacher really means what he says, and believes that it is of the utmost importance both for him to say it and for his congregation to hear.

The time, however, for these things has passed. The laity demand from the clergy something that shall interest and instruct them, and if both these requirements are not answered, the result must be a grievous loss to the Church. We are, therefore, very sorry to see the advertisements which continually appear in the newspapers offering lithographed sermons for sale; and we are sorry to read the letters which we often receive from professional purveyors of religious instruction, stating their terms for the supply of sermons, differing in price according to the occasion for which they are required, visitation sermons being the most expensive, sermons for special occasions, such as harvest thanksgivings, the next in value, and ordinary Sunday sermons the cheapest. There is much to be said on behalf of the clergy who use them. It is probable that the majority of them are not like their predecessors of the last generation, who preached their grandfathers' sermons

simply to save themselves trouble, but are really earnest and zealous parish priests, who, amidst the constant demands upon their time, can find no leisure for the composition of sermons. It is a hard case with many of them we know, but ought they not to consider before they have recourse to such expedients, whether the composition of sermons is not one of the most important parts of their pastoral work? Ought they not to entrust to others the care of clubs and the management of parochial charities before they allow the preparation of that teaching, with which they are bound to feed their flocks, to devolve on a hireling composer of sermons? There is something repugnant in the very idea, for we can scarcely understand how a pastor, who has real love for the souls of his people, and who by personal intercourse has made himself acquainted with their spiritual needs, is unable to find words to speak to them when he addresses them from the pulpit. It seems as unnatural for the pastor to hire or buy his sermons, as it was for the illiterate officer, of whom we have heard, to employ his more erudite sergeant to write letters to his betrothed bride. The sermons may be in themselves better than those he could himself compose, but they must lack that which is essential to a really good sermon, speaking from the heart of the preacher to the hearts of his people, whose needs he has discovered, either through the instrumentality of the confessional, or in the less formal way of ordinary pastoral intercourse.

There is also something to be said in defence of the system of borrowed sermons from the fact, that the Homilies were originally set forth for this very purpose; but the days of the Reformation were different from ours. Not only are the form and style of the Homilies obsolete, but the system supposes a different order of things from that which exists in our own time. Then, on account of the number of illiterate clergy, there were a few licensed preachers, and the need of instruction was met by the provision that the rest should read homilies which were set forth by authority, but there was no deception used in these cases. The miserable fraud was not palmed off upon the parishioners by which they were persuaded to believe that every written discourse was the preacher's own, until they learnt to doubt whether any written sermon was an original composition. Some such expedient was necessary on account of the paucity of sermons in the age which preceded the Reformation. The clergy were consequently untrained in the habit of preaching, but as this defect has been remedied in other branches of the Western Church, the clergy of the English Church ought to be ashamed to have recourse to expedients which their brethren of the Gallican and Italian Churches do not need.

At the time of the Reformation the art of preaching was but just emerging from a long lethargic sleep. The preaching of Latimer was for the most part mere twaddle, but its vivacity and

constant allusion to passing events caused it to have a heart-stirring effect upon the people. The sermons of John Knox were empty declamation, but their constant inculcation of treason and application of Scripture to the political events of the day imparted to them a marvellous power over the disloyal minds of the Scotchmen. Later on we find the science of preaching advancing with a rapid growth. The Elizabethan preacher was an improvement on the Edwardian, and the Jacobite and Caroline showed a still continued progress. The deep and sonorous language of Hooker succeeded to the bald oratory of Latimer, whilst Andrewes united the depth and learning of Hooker with a power of illustration which held the attention of his audience. Around these great preachers there were no doubt many imitators, for one great preacher's style and manner is always caught up by a flock of followers: so that we may fancy that Hooker and Andrewes highly diluted formed the staple of the teaching which was heard in many a country church in their respective ages. There was probably a fashion in preaching then as there has been in modern times. The later Caroline divines were intensely learned, and the Georgian ponderously dull. In the age of scepticism which succeeded the Restoration, the great preachers of the day naturally directed their discourses to the external evidences of religion. The country clergy took their cue, probably, from the university sermons which they heard during their residence at Oxford and Cambridge, and treated the rustics, who never doubted the truths of Christianity, to elaborate defences of revealed religion, which, clothed in grand and sonorous language, gave the people an intense idea of the learning of the clergy, but produced little effect upon their hearts. Dry, moral discourses formed on the basis of Plato and Aristotle followed, and were scarcely more edifying.

Hence we can understand the vast influence of Whitfield's and Wesley's preaching, which appealed directly to the hearts of men. Such preaching was, however, regarded as an innovation, and the suspicion which it aroused drove from the Church men who might have been amongst her greatest ornaments. Had they been treated with more consideration, they would not have been betrayed into the extremes which they adopted. Revolting from the dry discussions of the *external* evidences of religion, which had been the prevailing theme of the pulpit, they laid undue emphasis on the *internal* evidences, and made each man his own judge of truth. That which he felt in his heart he believed was true, because he believed it, and he believed it because he felt it was true. We are far from undervaluing the internal evidence which appeals directly to the heart, but when it is viewed apart from the authority of the Church and the voice of tradition, it is apt to lead men into dangerous errors. Their preaching, again, revolting from the dry morality which had been taught in English pulpits, went to the

other extreme of disregarding works and preaching faith without works as the source of justification, forgetting that faith without works is dead. The early Evangelicals attempted to combine the zeal of the Methodists with the faith of the Church, but this teaching, as a natural reaction from what had gone before, was merely subjective. There were indeed preachers such as Venn and Cecil, whose sermons may be read with interest and advantage in the present day, but for the most part the preaching of the Evangelical clergy had sadly degenerated before the revival of Church principles which followed the publication of the "Tracts for the Times." In the commencement of the present century popular preaching was mostly confined to the Evangelical clergy. The old orthodox party seemed to think that dry sermons were the test of orthodoxy, and the careless, amongst whom not a few may be reckoned, contented themselves with the reproduction of their grandfathers' sermons. The revival of Church principles did not at once produce earnest preachers. Indeed it was the fashion to suppose some years ago that preaching ought not to be attractive, lest people should come to church for the sermon instead of the worship of God. The utmost effort of young clergymen who went down from Oxford impregnated with the new revival, was to imitate the style and manner of Mr. Newman, and as imitations must be generally failures, their sermons produced little effect on their congregations. Meanwhile, standing aloof from party influences, Mr. Melvill was the great preacher of the day, and indirectly perhaps he influenced the preaching of the time more than the sermons of any other man. He appealed to the intelligence of his audience, and his elaborate and well adjusted diction riveted the attention of educated congregations. No one ever went home without a new idea impressed upon his mind; but there was a want of definite Church teaching which diminished its value, for the preacher was cautious of committing himself to the symbols of a party. Yet Mr. Melvill's preaching was of no slight advantage to the Church, for it always led men's minds in the right direction, if it failed to land them at the sacramental teaching which was well nigh forgotten in the Church. Mr. Woodford we regard as a disciple of Melvill who, as disciples sometimes do, soars higher than his master. No one can hear Mr. Woodford without being reminded of Mr. Melvill in the zenith of his influence. The style and manner of the master have been appropriated by Mr. Woodford, and used to a higher purpose, and if his claims to originality are in some measure impaired, we may allow him the credit of being no servile imitator, but an improver on that which some years ago was deemed to be perfect, and he has devoted with vast success an adopted style to the delineation of Catholic truth.

The Bishop of Oxford's preaching, from his earnest manner, and the sonorous cadence of his voice, must always be attractive.

Many have caught his manner and his cadences, but while some have been successful, too many have fancied that a sonorous roll of the voice was sufficient to give life to empty platitudes.

And now we come to Mr. Liddon, whose University sermons have suggested the foregoing train of thought. We cannot but regard him as really the most eloquent preacher of the day, and the sermons which bear the title prefixed to this article, are a model of pulpit oratory. Not that they are suited to ordinary congregations, or capable of reproduction in country pulpits, but because they just answered the purpose for which they were delivered. There is evidence in them, not only of close and accurate study, but of intimate acquaintance with the hearts of those to whom they were addressed. It is clear that Mr. Liddon's knowledge of the intellectual difficulties, and the temptations which are incidental to University life, is not derived from the superficial knowledge which college tutors generally possess of the minds of their pupils. During his career as Vice-Principal of Cuddesden, and subsequently of S. Edmund Hall, he had ample opportunities of cultivating acquaintance with the inner recesses of the hearts of the most intelligent class of University students, and the opportunity was in no way neglected. Side by side with the mass of Christian learning contained in the tomes of ancient Fathers, and with the theology and neology of modern times, he made the human heart his especial study, and has learnt to appreciate the difficulties, and to understand the needs of the peculiar congregation whom he addressed. Mr. Liddon has, moreover, a rare facility of imparting life to his sermons, by illustrating them from matters of passing interest. He never employs the circumlocution, which is so often deemed essential to the dignity of the pulpit, but he goes straight to the point at once, and speaks of things as they really are, so as to leave no doubt as to his meaning. To give anything like an analysis of a series of sermons, which are unconnected with each other, would be beside our purpose; but if any one wishes to know what preaching should be, we must refer them to the sermons of Mr. Liddon's volume, as the best illustration to which we can point.

To select passages as specimens of Mr. Liddon's style and manner of treatment is also unnecessary, because his style is well-known, and no particular passage could do justice to his mode of treatment; yet if any of the sermons must be mentioned as more especially deserving of attention, the first and the fourth seem to us to bear the palm. In the first the necessity of personal religion is asserted, and its position vindicated as not only consistent with, but essential to true Catholic principles. We would strongly recommend the perusal of this sermon to the somewhat profane author of the word "Churchianity" as antagonistic to Christianity. The following passage will give the reader some idea of the scope of the sermon:

"For a well-balanced Christian mind there can be as little danger of a strong sense of his personal relation to the Source of all life, issuing in a selfish forgetfulness of others, as there can be of his forgetting what is due to the needs and culture of his own soul, while he 'walks about Zion, and marks well her bulwarks, and tells the towers thereof.' A man need not forget his separate relation to GOD when contemplating the progress, the organization, the imperial majesty of the realm of CHRIST. It would be as untrue to say that the writer of the 'Imitation' was insensible to the claims of the Church, or to the interests of humanity at large, as to argue that the authors of the 'De Civitate Dei,' or the 'Ecclesiastical Polity,' must have overlooked the sorrows and aspirations of the human soul. It may, however, be admitted, that the undue predominance of one of these considerations is a danger for individuals, or for particular ages or portions of the Church."—P. 4.

In the fourth sermon the different theories of immortality are examined *seriatim*, and the hollowness of all, save the Christian doctrine, is eloquently and convincingly shown. The sermon is summed up in the following words:

"What the representatives of an advanced civilization are among a herd of savages, such are the saints of GOD when we compare them with ordinary men. They have higher aims, larger horizons, more commanding points of view, a loftier, nay, a totally distinct conception of life and destiny. It is said that the Roman conquerors of the world carried in their faces the secret of the triumphs of an imperial people. Much more do sincere Christians walk the earth with the mien and bearing of a race of immortals, although the rays of spiritual majesty, which stream forth from the burning spirit within, often do but illumine the weakness of the body which yet encases it. Of such it is literally true, that 'whether they live, they live unto the LORD; or whether they die, they die unto the LORD.' They know that the few years of time are but a halt at the gate of eternity; and that true wisdom consists in practically understanding the ineffaceable distinction, which parts that which perishes before our very eyes from that which must last for ever."—P. 127.

We have said, that that which strikes us as peculiarly admirable in Mr. Liddon's sermons, is their adaptation to the special needs of those to whom they were addressed; and we have traced the secret of their power to the preacher's intimate acquaintance with the minds of University students. His power of sympathy with the minds of men of other classes, combined with his eloquence and power of adaptation, has made him no less popular as a preacher to mixed congregations than in the pulpit of S. Mary's. Few can aspire to Mr. Liddon's reputation; but the characteristics of his preaching—which render his sermons so effective—are easily attained, and this is the lesson which we wish to draw from the volume before us. To attack rationalism in country pulpits, or to

appeal to the intellectual difficulties of scholars in preaching to agricultural congregations, would be something like Don Quixote's encounter with the windmill; but still rustics have mental difficulties, and the poor have their own especial temptations, and these the preacher must discover for himself in his intercourse with his parishioners, if he wishes his sermons to be really effective. The circumstances of each parish have their own peculiar characteristics, and this is why another man's sermons, or even his own old ones preached in other places, will rarely suit the purpose of the really earnest preacher.

The Dean of Canterbury's papers on this subject, read at the Church Congress at Bristol and Norwich, are very valuable and suggestive, and we heartily agree with him that real clerical training can only be effected by means of experience in pastoral work. The University curriculum is an invaluable foundation; theological colleges provide definite theological instruction; but pastoral work, including preaching, can only be learnt by experience. If the diaconate were what it ought to be, it would give that training in pastoral work which the clergy need. We doubt the wisdom of Dean Alford's suggestion of an introduction to parochial duties before ordination by candidates becoming pupils of an experienced parish priest, with whom they should reside for some months, because we think that this time can scarcely be spared from the study of dogmatic theology, considering the short interval which usually elapses between the degree and ordination, and also because we think that in a diaconate passed under the direct supervision of the priest, the grace of ordination would be a great assistance to the novice, and that while he learnt he might still be able to teach with authority. Much is said of the previous training of priests in the Roman Church, but we very much doubt whether the majority of sermons preached by young Roman priests are at all superior to those of the Anglican; and there certainly seems something unreal in preaching simply by way of exercise, from which the young preacher would probably contract a mannerism and affectation, which would hinder his usefulness when he came to preach real sermons to immortal souls.

The requisites for a good preacher, then, we may describe as three. (1.) Intimate acquaintance with Holy Scripture, and the doctrines of the Church: (2.) Intimate acquaintance with his own heart: and, (3.) Intimate acquaintance with the hearts of his people. If he possesses these three qualifications his sermons can scarcely be altogether fruitless. If he knows his people, and does not preach his own sermons, he has laid in a store of material which he never uses, and if he preaches his own without cultivating an acquaintance with their inner selves, it will not be wonderful that his sermons should miss their mark. They may be excellent in themselves, but will fail to edify the people.

There are three kinds of sermons. Dogmatic, Hortatory, and Expository. The first by itself generally fails to interest an ordinary congregation, and the reason is that the hortatory element does not sufficiently enter into it. If, however, the connection between faith and practice is clearly shown, dogmatic teaching will generally cease to be unpopular. Bishop Pearson's great book on the Creed is eminently practical, while at the same time it is profoundly dogmatic.

If three sermons are to be preached in one day, it may be well that they should vary somewhat in their style. The morning sermon may be an exhortation founded on the Gospel or Epistle for the day, with especial reference to the great act of Christian Sacrifice, which is probably about to be offered. In the afternoon, if catechising be adopted after the second lesson, the catechising will naturally lead up to a brief and clear exposition of some one article of the Christian faith, in which the children have just before been catechised. Those who have heard the catechetical lectures, which Mr. Bennett used to deliver at S. Paul's, Knightsbridge, will remember how interesting they were made to the general congregation. The evening sermon again might be properly employed in the exposition of connected portions of Scripture, such as Dean Alford recommends, and of which we suppose Dr. Vaughan's Lectures on the Thessalonians may be taken as a sample. There are times when the order may be interrupted, but we agree with the Dean of Canterbury in thinking that expository sermons are useful both to the preacher and his congregation; to the former, as not only necessitating, but as also giving an immediate practical zest to his studies; and to the latter as deepening their interest in the perusal of the Book of God's Word.

Whether sermons should be written or unwritten will be a question for each to decide for himself. It is well that every preacher should preach unwritten sermons sometimes, that the people may see that out of the fulness of his heart his mouth can speak, and he will thus acquire a more easy and natural manner in the delivery of his written discourses. Dean Alford recommends that expository sermons should be unwritten, but we should have thought that as a general rule the fact of writing them would make them more valuable and solid. If any kind of sermons are best unwritten, we should have said that it was the hortatory; but whilst on this subject, we must observe that written sermons are, we believe, more often extempore than unwritten ones. The sermon which is written off in haste on Saturday night, without any previous preparation or study, will have all the faults of an extempore sermon without its compensating advantages; whilst with a few exceptions no unwritten sermon which is not carefully prepared beforehand will be of lasting benefit to the congregation. A copious flow of words may hide its emptiness at the time of its

delivery, but it will be found to have left no impression on the minds of those who have listened, and whose attention was fixed by the torrent of words which flowed from the preacher's mouth.

The style should be simple and clear. Figurative illustrations will often serve to fix a thought on the mind, but a style always florid "will generally prevail in direct proportion to the absence of worthy subject-matter and really earnest thought." Every sermon should be carefully divided in the preacher's mind into its several parts; but the time has gone by when it was customary to announce the division as "*firstly, secondly, thirdly, and, lastly, a few words of practical application.*" This method was too artificial, and therefore wearisome, and sometimes the divisions were too far-fetched. We remember, for instance, once hearing an eminent preacher of the Evangelical school thus commence a sermon: "The purpose for which I appear before you to-day is to plead for the Church Pastoral Aid Society, the name of which suggests the divisions of my discourse: 1st. We have a Church. 2ndly. In that Church there are pastors. 3rdly. These Pastors want Aid."

With regard to the length of sermons, experience will soon show how long the attention of a congregation can be retained. The sermon should be over before the people are tired, and they should be left with the feeling that it has been too short. We must remember, that in these days of rapid movement, people are sooner wearied than they were in the old Puritan times, when the hour-glass was turned again. The sermons of S. Chrysostom, S. Augustine, S. Bernard, and all the great preachers of old were short, and those of the Apostles which are recorded in the Acts are of no great length. As a general rule, from twenty minutes to half an hour ought to be sufficient for any sermon, and he who prunes his thoughts and words of all redundancies can easily compress it within these limits.

There are so many treatises on preaching which will be found useful and suggestive, that we cannot attempt to give a list. S. Gregory the Great, "*de cura pastoralis*;" S. Chrysostom, "*de sacerdotio*," amongst the ancients: Burnet's *Pastoral Care*, Mr. Gresley's *Treatise*, and the late Professor Hussey's *Letter to a Young Clergyman*, will all be found useful.

Models may be of service in the formation of style, but too much cannot be said against following any model in the acquirement of manner. Let it only be natural, and frank, and earnest, and it will be sure to succeed. For dogmatic sermons we have plenty of models amongst our English divines, but the language of our great masters of theology will require translation into the style of the present generation. In hortatory preaching we are certainly improving, but we have no models equal to Bossuet, Massillon, and Bourdaloue, amongst the Gallicans, and Segneri amongst the Italians. The Homilies of S. Augustine and S. Chry-

most will be useful as the foundation of expository addresses, but modern models have yet to be made. Mr. Isaac Williams' sermons on the Epistles and Gospels are perhaps the nearest approach to this that we have, but the scope of each is of necessity too wide, and the course without sufficient connection to supply a model.

We need scarcely apologise for having made Mr. Liddon's sermons the text of a discourse upon sermons in general, for the subject is one of great importance, and Mr. Liddon's University sermons are an evidence that the Church of England is able to provide a supply of pulpit oratory which shall equal that of the bar or the senate.

RAWLINSON'S ANCIENT MONARCHIES.

The Five Great Monarchies of the Ancient Eastern World ; or, the History, Geography, and Antiquities of Chaldæa, Assyria, Babylon, Media, and Persia, collected and illustrated from Ancient and Modern Sources. By GEORGE RAWLINSON, M.A., Camden Professor of Ancient History in the University of Oxford, late Fellow and Tutor of Exeter College. In Four Volumes ; Vol. III. London : John Murray, Albemarle Street. 1865. 8vo. Pp. 531.

PROFESSOR Rawlinson illustrates in the volume before us the history of Media and Babylonia, in the same exhaustive and accurate manner in which he has treated the monarchies which form the subject of his former volumes. He is not content with describing the religion and the history and chronology of these countries, but he also describes the physical aspect of the country itself; going into copious detail in reference to both climate and production. The beautiful illustrations with which his volumes abound, add considerable force to the description of the text. The geography of Media does not furnish any very interesting matter for description; numbers of barren rocky ranges, interspersed with arid plains and valleys often wholly destitute of waters, "impress the traveller with a feeling of sadness and weariness."

"Still there are considerable exceptions to this general aspect of desolation. In the worst parts of the region there is a time after the spring rains when nature puts on a holiday dress and the country becomes gay and cheerful, the slopes at the base of the rocky ranges are tinged with an emerald green, a richer vegetation springs up over the plains, which are covered with a fine herbage, or with a variety of crops. The fruit-trees which surround the villages burst out into the most luxuriant blossom; the roses come into bloom, and their per-

fume everywhere fills the air. For the two months of April and May the whole face of the country is changed, and a lovely verdure replaces the ordinary dull sterility."—P. 8.

The cities of the Median territory which are described, are the north and south Ecbatanas, Raga or Rages, Charat, Bagistan, Adrasan; and then we pass into Armenia and the Salt Desert, and to the country round the Caspian Sea. A charming view is given of the Mazanderan with the Caspian Sea in the distance. This is well described as being a well-watered and richly-wooded and fertile region. The alluvial soil soon rises into swelling hills, and these again into lofty mountains, which on one side are clothed,

"nearly to their summit with dwarf oaks or with shrub and brushwood; while, lower down, their flanks are covered with forests of elms, cedars, chestnuts, beeches, and cypress-trees. The gardens and orchards of the natives are of the most superb character, the vegetation is luxuriant. Lemons, oranges, peaches, pomegranates, besides other fruits abound. Rice, hemp, sugar-canes, mulberries are cultivated with success, vines grow wild, and the valleys are strewn with flowers of rare fragrance, among which may be noted the rose, the honeysuckle, and the sweetbriar."—P. 36.

Unfortunately this region is very unhealthy, and a large number of tigers renders the sojourn in it very dangerous. The general features of this description were taken from the writings of Kinnier, Ouseley, Fraser, Chesney, and from Mr. Todd's papers in the journal of the Geographical Society.

The southern Ecbatana, so well described by the ancients, was visited by Mr. Ker Porter, who took accurate measurements of some of its buildings. Mr. Loftus devoted some time to the measurement of the palace at Susa, which very much resembled the palaces of Ecbatana and Persepolis. It seems wonderful, considering the great size of these palaces, that their pillars were made of wood and not of stone; either of cedar or of cypress wood; sometimes being plated with silver, at other times even with gold. Architectural beauty they did not seem to possess; their effect was rather due to decoration than to construction.

The famous Behistun which marks the site once occupied by the city of Bagistan, and of which an illustration is given in the volume, is also a very remarkable place. It lies on the route between Babylon and Ecbatana, and presents "the unusual combination of a copious fountain, a rich plain, and a rock suitable for sculptures." Taken as a whole the towns of Media were not very striking. "The Medes did not like to congregate in large cities, but preferred to scatter themselves in villages over their broad and varied territory." In describing the climate, Professor Rawlinson quotes from Morier an extraordinary effect of heat in that part of Media which is situated on the great plateau.

"The intense heat of the summer sun sinking on the dry sand, or the saline efflorescence of the desert throws the air over them into such a state of quivering undulation, as produces the most wonderful and varying effects, distorting the forms of objects, and rendering the most familiar strange and hard to be recognized. A mud bank furrowed by the rain will exhibit the appearance of a magnificent city, with columns, domes, minarets, and pyramids; a few stunted bushes will be formed into a forest of stately trees; a distant mountain will in the space of a minute assume the appearance of a lofty peak, then swell out at the top to resemble a mighty mushroom; next split into several parts; and finally settle down into a flat table-land. Occasionally, though not very often, that semblance of water is produced, which Europeans are apt to suppose the usual effect of mirage."—P. 49.

The natural productions in the way of minerals and vegetables, with the wild animals, fish, birds, reptiles, insects, and the domestic animals, are all enumerated with considerable exactness. A woodcut is given of the destructive locust, a most ungainly looking beast which comes as a dark cloud over southern Media; "moving in a slow and steady flight, and with a sound like that of heavy rain, and settling in myriads on the fields, the gardens, the trees, the terraces of the houses, and even the streets, which they sometimes cover completely." It is needless to say that all vegetation disappears beneath such a fatal plague.

The character, manners, and customs of the people, together with their art, forms the subject of an interesting chapter. Their Arian physiognomy, their arms, their robes and shoes, and head-dresses, even their collars and ear-rings, are illustrated by engravings in the text, which give a life and a freshness to the old descriptions of Xenophon and Strabo. The ancient Medes, it would seem, were just as much given to vanity as the most fastidious would be at the present day. The Medes were very fond of ornament, and were very luxurious in their habits.

"According to Xenophon they were acquainted with most of the expedients, by the help of which vanity attempts to conceal the ravages of time, and to create an artificial beauty. They employed cosmetics, which they rubbed into the skin for the purpose of improving the complexion. They made use of an abundance of false hair. Like many other Oriental nations, both ancient and modern, they applied dyes to enhance the brilliancy of the eyes, and give them a greater apparent size and softness. They were also fond of wearing golden ornaments."—P. 87.

It is from the Zendavesta we learn, that the religion of the Medes formed one of the earliest phases of Arian belief. It was a sort of Polytheistic worship, with hymns in honour of the gods, in which were offered both bloody and unbloody sacrifices, with an intoxicating liquor with which the priests made themselves

drunken. When the Iranian, Median, and Persian system became organized, the religion in some respects changed for the better; it became more practical and less ideal. Its latest form was that of Magism. Professor Rawlinson thus pictorially describes its later phase:

"Upon the whole Magism, though less elevated and less pure than the old Zoroastrian creed, must be pronounced to have possessed a certain loftiness and picturesqueness which suited it to become the religion of a great and splendid monarchy. The mysterious fire-altars on the mountain-tops, with a prestige of a remote antiquity:—the ever-burning flame believed to have been kindled from on high—the worship in the open air under the blue canopy of heaven—the long troops of Magians in their white robes with their strange caps, and their mystic wands—the frequent prayers—the abundant sacrifices—the long incantations—the supposed prophetic powers of the priest-caste—all this together constituted an imposing whole at once to the eye and to the mind, and was calculated to give additional grandeur to the civil system that should be allied with it. Pure Zoroastrianism was too spiritual to coalesce readily with Oriental luxury and magnificence, or to lend strength to a government based on the ordinary principles of Asiatic despotism. Magism furnished a hierarchy to support the throne, and add splendour and dignity to the court; while they overawed the subject-class by their supposed possession of supernatural powers, and of the right of mediating between heaven and man. It supplied a picturesque worship, which at once gratified the senses, and excited the fancy."—P. 185.

We regret that space forbids us from quoting the remainder of these eloquent remarks on the Magian worship. The lover of comparative philology will find much to interest him in the linguistic analysis of the Median language and proper names. The cuneiform writing is very clearly explained, whilst the notion is negatived, of its having ever been used for ordinary purposes. It is most conveniently expressed in clay or on stone by "three taps of the chisel with the hammer;" the wedges fall out; they would be very difficult to represent on parchment. The most critical portion of this description of the Median empire relates to its chronology and history. The reign of Astyages (B.C. 593,) is graphically described with a power which would almost belong to an eye-witness of the very events themselves.

The fourth monarchy is Babylonia, and on the whole presents more features of interest than the Median kingdom. It is treated of too in rather more detail, the history being summed up in eight chapters: the extent of the empire, the climate and productions, the people, the capital, the arts and sciences, the manners and customs, the religion, the history and chronology, each forming a separate chapter. The empire embraced about eighteen thousand

square miles of country, and is divided into various districts, such as those of Susiana, Chaldea, Philistia, Edom, Palmyrena, Cœle-Syria, Judea, and Phœnicia. Besides Babylon there were about ten large cities which flourished contemporaneously with it. A view is given of the Sea of Antioch, the existence of which was doubted from the silence of antiquity regarding it, and yet it is a large lake, in its greatest diameter more than ten miles, being about seven miles across. It is generally rather shallow; and as it lies in a marshy reedy plain, it may not have attracted much notice in ancient times. Among the trees or shrubs of the valley of the Euphrates, we find the oleander, the myrtle, the bay, the arbutus, the clematis, the juniper, and the honeysuckle. The vine, the mulberry, and the olive, together with the orange and the pomegranate, are cultivated in places. "Melons, cucumbers, and most of the ordinary vegetables, are produced in abundance, and of good quality everywhere." The mineral wealth was not great: the birds form an important feature in Babylonian natural history. The people seem to have been a fine race, with long flowing hair and a large beard; the Chaldean females being tall and large-limbed, sometimes having long conspicuous hair.

"On the whole," says Professor Rawlinson, "it is most probable that the physical type of the Babylonians was nearly that of their northern neighbours. A somewhat sparer form, longer and more flowing hair and features, less stern and strong, may perhaps have characterised them."—P. 328.

Their intellectual ability was great, especially in astronomy and mathematics. They had commercial energy also, being strongly bitten with a trading spirit. They were sumptuous and costly in their way of living.

"The pleasures of the table were carried to excess. Drunkenness was common. Rich unguents were invented. The tables groaned under the weight of gold and silver plate. In every possible way the Babylonians practised luxuriousness of living; and in respect of softness and self-indulgence they certainly did not fall short of any nation of antiquity."—P. 331.

But the chief interest in this monarchy centres itself in the capital: it is Babylon itself that we turn to with the most eager curiosity. Professor Rawlinson has condensed an enormous amount of research into the fourth chapter, in which we have two ground-plans given to us; the one being a chart of ancient Babylon, and the other a chart of the country round it, with limits of the ancient city as determined by M. Oppert in his *Expédition scientifique en Mésopotamie*. It seems to be a most difficult thing to determine what the actual size of the town was, especially as no traces of the walls of Babylon have been discovered. The ancient

authorities would make it to be nearly forty miles in circumference; upon which it is remarked, "It is difficult to suppose that the real city—the streets and squares—can at any time have occupied one-half of this enormous area." There was a space very large between the buildings and the outward walls, where corn could be grown, and which was divided by straight roads. There were a hundred gates in the wall, twenty-five on either side, which represented as many streets; "and outside each gate was a sloped landing-place, by which you could descend to the water's edge, if you had occasion to cross the river." The houses were three or four stories high, having beams of palm-wood, and round the wooden pillars were twisted bands of rushes, which were covered with plaster, and then painted. The great Temple of Belus was the most remarkable building of the city, the height of its tower being, according to Strabo, more than 606 feet. The image of Bel was made of gold, with a golden table standing in front of it, and at this shrine there was anciently a human figure twelve cubits high, made of solid gold. Besides this temple there was a great palace, having its external wall nearly seven miles in circumference. But even this was eclipsed by the glory of the "hanging gardens" of the palace, each square side of which measured four hundred feet.

"It was supported upon several tiers of open arches built one over the other, like the walls of a classic theatre, and sustaining at each stage or story a solid platform, from which the piers of the next tier of arches rose. The building towered into the air to the height of at least seventy-five feet, and was covered at the top with a great mass of earth, in which there grew not merely shrubs and flowers, but trees also of the largest size."

Mechanical contrivances supplied the plants with water, and prevented the decay of the arches.

"The ascent to the garden was by steps: on the way up, among the arches which sustained the building, were stately apartments, which must have been pleasant from their coolness."

The contrast between the past and the present is very marked. The walls are broken down, there are neither arches nor pillars to be seen, nothing but "heaps" ungainly and shapeless, sometimes composed of pottery and bricks, the soil being in places "deeply impregnated with nitre, infallible indications of its having been once covered with buildings." The chart of the ruins of Babylon is one of the greatest curiosities of this interesting volume.

From the numerous illustrations before us we cannot form a very high opinion of Babylonian art; their brickmaking seemed to be their most successful production. The "Babylonian brick," which is figured at page 394 with its inscription, such as was common upon all their bricks, would we think delight the artisan of the present day. Yet we must not be overhasty in our judgment

of Babylonian works of art, for Professor Rawlinson tells us, that it is "probable that the most elaborate and most artistic of the Babylonian works of art, were of a kind which has almost wholly perished." Some of their seals and gems were cut with a remarkable skill and minuteness; their pottery seems to have been decidedly elegant, judging of it from the examples we have seen. In science, astronomy and mathematics were the chief branches under cultivation.

The following description brings before us a slight sketch of the Babylonian life:

"The diet of the richer classes was no doubt varied and luxurious. Wheaten bread, meats of various kinds, luscious fruits, fish, game, loaded the board, and wine imported from abroad was the usual beverage. The wealthy Babylonians were fond of drinking to excess. Their banquets were magnificent, but they generally ended in drunkenness. They were not, however, mere scenes of coarse indulgence, but had a certain refinement, which distinguished them from the riotous drinkings of the less civilized Medes. Music was in Babylon a recognized accompaniment of the feast, and bands of performers, entering with the wine, entertained the guests with concerted pieces. A rich odour of perfumes floated around, for the Babylonians were connoisseurs in unguents; the eye was delighted with the display of gold and silver plate, the splendid dresses of the guests, the exquisite carpets and hangings, the numerous attendants, gave an air of grandeur to the scene, and seemed half to excuse the excess of which too many were guilty."—P. 451.

As many as 150 women have performed the music at a banquet, some singing, and others playing on instruments. It is needless to point out how the history and chronology of the Babylonian empire bears upon Sacred history and chronology, and how wonderfully the inscriptions upon bricks and cylinders bear an unequivocal testimony to the literal truth of certain statements in the Old Testament.

This third volume is quite worthy of its predecessors. "The Five Great Monarchies" will place Professor Rawlinson in a very high position; his scholarship is not out of keeping with his immense erudition, and with his most painstaking investigation of the smallest details of his subject. As our extracts will show, his book is very pleasant reading. It requires a thorough master of the subject to write so clearly and so easily on matters which might be treated as mere archaeological fragments. It would not be true to say, that this exhaustive work will not grow obsolete in time; but it would be quite true to say, that up to the present time it is by far the completest *resumé* of the knowledge gathered from an infinitude of sources, which has appeared in this or in any other language, of the ancient peoples of which it treats.

RICHARD ROLLE, THE YORKSHIRE HERMIT OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

(Continued from p. 16.)

ATTENTION is now being greatly drawn to the early literature of our English race. We are no longer content to assume that before such and such a period there was no power of expressing thought or enforcing truth, or giving vent to fancy, in the tongue of the land—that Chaucer was the first English poet—and Wickliffe the first English religious writer. The days of this ignorance are happily passed by, but even yet we do not value as we ought the ancient writings of the men of our land, nor duly estimate the good Saxon solidity of their religious teaching, nor try as much as we might to get a true insight into the state of the country socially and morally from contemporary compositions. Even yet a common opinion as to the state of things for the three centuries after the Normans came, is, that the churchmen wrote only in Latin, and the gentry talked only in French, both of which notions are erroneous. The English language was never actually displaced. There was always even an English literature. Some very striking specimens of thirteenth century English have lately been published.¹ Of fourteenth century composition the religious poem of Robert of Brunne and Dan Michel's Kentish Remorse of Conscience,² are now in print, to say nothing of the better known poems of Piers Plowman, and others. But a vast mass of the English of this date still lies in MS. in our great libraries, and to this it is desirable on every account that attention should be directed. Among fourteenth century manuscripts the writings of Richard Rolle will be found to hold a prominent place, and it is clear that his compositions had obtained a great and wide-spread popularity. This popularity caused the copies of them to be multiplied exceedingly both in Latin and in English, and in the various dialects of the latter, Northern, Midland, and Southern. It is pointed out by Mr. Morris³ that more than a century later than Richard the Hermit the Rev. John Pery, Canon of Holy Trinity without Aldgate, who wrote for the instruction of his parishioners a little treatise on Heaven and Hell, takes all the leading ideas and almost the very words from the Prick of Conscience. But most of the adaptations were not confessed to be such, and the treatise still passed under the name of the Hermit of Hampole. In some cases where a

¹ As for instance, "The story of Genesis and Exodus," 1250, published by the Early English Text Society.

² Published by the Roxburghe Club.

³ Preface to Prick of Conscience, Philol. Society, 1863.

translation was made from Latin into English, the name of the translator appears. This is the case with a MS. in the library of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, in which an English version of Richard Rolle's *Incendium Amoris* is made by one Richard Misyn, of the order of Carmelites. There are without doubt numerous other translations not made by the Hermit himself, but the authors of which we cannot trace. In investigating the causes of this influence of an obscure recluse on the religious mind of his age we may attribute it in the first place to the vividness and boldness of his imagination. When one ventured like Richard the Hermit to map out the localities of the unseen world, to lay down as from actual observation the position, the nature, the different pains of purgatory and hell; to systematise and enumerate the joys of heaven—this bold adventure into the unknown was certain to find numerous admirers. Again, the sombre and terrific utterances which the Hermit gave forth could scarce fail to attract the awe-struck attention of his age. According to him the world was fast hastening to its end; death, clothed in hideous terrors, was awaiting all; even the good were at that awful time to be tormented with the sight of devils.

“Bot a gret payne than til us sal this be,
 The sight of tham when we tham see,
 For all the men here of this lyfe
 Swa grysely a sight couth nought descryfe,¹
 Ne thurgh wyt ymagyn ne deme
 Als thai sal in tyme of dede seme.”²

The terrors and dangers that surround the parting-hour are studiously magnified; scarce any ray of comfort is allowed to penetrate the dark profound. It is desirable, according to the Hermit, that every man should live in constant dread and fear. And then after the spirit has taken its flight from the body the pains of purgatory await it. These are said to be more severe than all the sufferings of martyrs, the least pain in purgatory being greater than the most terrible earthly pain; yea, one day's pain in purgatory being greater than a year's most strict penance on earth. But purgatory lasts only till doomsday. Hell lasts for ever—and upon the description of this the Hermit exhausts his utmost power, producing images of appalling terror, and well calculated to have a terrific effect upon the “lewed folk” for whom the *Prick of Conscience* was written.

It is interesting to compare Richard Rolle's handling of his awful subject with that of his great Italian contemporary, Dante. And although the poetical element, and the grace of diction are almost wanting in the Northumbrian hermit, and though an ex-

¹ Describe.

² *Prick of Conscience*, 2298.

cessive iteration fatigues the reader, yet the sensation of horror is perhaps likely to be produced by his poem fully as much as by that of the Italian. And together with "the horrible imaginings" which are found so frequent in Richard Rolle's writings, there were also his high claims as a mystic. It has been already pointed out that he asserted himself to be *extaticus*, and in accordance with this we find in his writings deep mystical teaching on the inner life of the soul. Now mysticism has always exercised a powerful fascination over the human mind. The "Loves of the Soul" which have given birth to so many convents, and formed the devout study of so many Protestants; in which S. Theresa and Catherine of Sienna range side by side with Count Zinzendorf and Jacob Böhmen; and Joannes à Cruce and Rusbrochius with William Law and Edward Irving—these loves of the soul and its power of absolute union with the Divinity were the favourite theme of Richard Rolle. And this was the type of religion that was universally accepted in his day as the highest. The extreme unpopularity and contempt into which churchmen had fallen in the fourteenth century, and to which the pages of Piers Plowman, Chaucer, and Gower, bear abundant witness, are plainly attributed to their secularity and meddling in the affairs of state. The bishops and parish priests had left the country, and gone to London, where—

"Somme serve the kynge and thus selver tellen,
In the chekkere and the chauncelrie—
Somme aren as seneschals and serve other lordes,
And ben in stede of stywardes, and sitten and demen."¹
Piers Plowman.

According to the same satirist the hermits were wandering about the country in bands, followed by "their wenches," the pilgrims were going in great companies to visit Saint James at Compostella, that they might have "lefe to lye al thure lyf tym." The friars of the four orders, and the pardoners with the Pope's Bulls were trafficking only for money, while holy Church suffered and drooped. A little later the crying evil was the going of clerks to the French wars.

"But while the law is ruled so,
That clerkes to the werre intende,
I not trowe thei shall amende
The wofull worlde in other things."
Gower, Prologue.

The ideal of a devout clerk and of a truly holy man was one who kept aloof from all this worldliness, and by contemplation and austerity so far subdued the flesh that he was able to realise the true powers of the spirit. And this ideal, if we may judge from

Calculate.

the intense vigour of his mystical and contemplative writings was in a great measure exhibited in the Hermit of Hampole.

We are now about to lay before the reader a very remarkable composition of this very remarkable man, in which he seems as it were to quit the earth and to move familiarly in the high regions of spirit-land, explaining and mapping out the country as one who had solved all its mysteries.

1 "Dere ffrende, wit thou wele that the ende and the soveraynte of perfeccion standes in a verray anehede² of GODD and of manes saule. By perfayte charyte this ende than es verrayly made. Whene the myghtes of the saule er resen made³ by grace to the dignitey and the state of the firste condicione; that is whene the mynde es stabelede sadely⁴ with-owtten changeynge and vagacyone in GODD and gastely thynges, and when the resone es cleryde fra all worldly and fleschely behaldynges and imagycyones, fygyres and fantasyes of creatures, and es illumenede with grace for to be-halde GODDE and gastly thynges. And whene the will and the affeccyone es puryfiede and clensede fra all fleschely lustes kyndely⁵ and worldly lufe, and es enflawmede with brennande lufe of the HALY GASTE. Bot this wondirfull anehede may noghte be fulfillede perfytly, contenually, ne hally, in this lyfe for corrupcyone of the flesche, bot anely in the blysse of Hevene. Neverthe-lattere⁶ the nerre that a saule in this present lyfe may come to this anehede the mare perfitte it es, for that it es reformede by grace till the ymage and the lyknes of his creatoure here; one this manere wyse the more joy and blysse salle it have in Hevene. Oure LORDE GODD es ane endless beyng with-owtten chaungynge; all-myghty with-owtten faylynge; soverayne wysdome, lyghte, sofastnes,⁷ with-owtten errorr or myrkenes; soverayne gudnes, lufe, pees and swetnes; than the mare that a saule es anehede, fastened, confourmede, and joynede to oure LORD GODD, the mare stabille it es and myghty, the mare wyse and clere, gude, peyseble, luffande and mare vertuous, and so it es mare perfite. . . . Mekill comforthe it reschayves of oure LORDE noghte anely inwardly in his⁸ preve substance be the vertu of the anehede to oure LORDE that lyes in knawynge and lufynge of GODD, in hyghte of gastely brynnynge⁹ of hym, in transfourmyng of the saule in the Godhede, bot also in many other comforthes and savours, swetnes and wondirfulle felynges in sere¹⁰ manners. Some saule by virtue of the charyte that GODD gyfes it es so clensede that all creaturs in all that he heris or sese or felis by any of his wittes turnes him till comforthe and gladnes, and the sensualite¹¹ receyves newe savour and swetnes in all creaturs; and righte als¹² before the likynges in the sensualite ware fleschely vayne and vecyous for the payn of the orygynalle synne, righte so now thay are made gastely and clene with-owtten bitternes and

¹ MS. Thornton, Linc. Cath. Library.

² Made to rise.

³ Natural.

⁴ Truth.

⁵ Burning.

¹¹ Senses.

⁶ Oneness.

⁴ Firmly.

⁶ Nevertheless.

⁸ Its.

¹⁰ Various, several.

¹² Just as.

bytynge of conceyence. And this es the gudnes of oure LORDE that sen¹ the saule es puneschede in the sensualite, and the flesche es pertynere of the payne, thus, efterwarde, the saule be comfortshede in hir sensualite and the flesche be felawe of the joye and comforth with the saule, noghte fleschely, bot gastely, als he was felawe in tribulacione and payne. This es the fredom and the lordchipe, dygnyte and the wyrchipp that a manes saule hase over alle creaturs; the whilke dygnyte he may receyve by grace here that ilk a creature savoure to hym als it es. And that es when by grace he sese and he heres, or he felys anely GODD in all creaturs. One this maner-wyse a saule es made gastely in the sensualite by abowndance of charite that es in the substance of the saule. Also oure LORDE comforthes a saule by aungells sange, bot what that sange es it may noghte be dyscryned by no bodyly lyknes, for it es gastely and abowne alle manere of ymagynacyone and manes resone. It may be perceyvede and felide in a saule, bot it may noghte be spokene. Neverthelattere I speke thare-of to the als me thynke. When a saule es purifyede by the lufe of GODD, illumynede by wyse-dome, stabled by myghte of GODD, than es the eghe of the saule opyned to be-halde gastely thynges, as vertus, aungells and haly saules and heavenly thynges. Thane es the saule abille by-cause of clennes² to fele the toucheynge, the spekyng of gude aūngells. This touchyng and spekyng es gastely, noghte bodyly; for when the saule es lyftede and raysede owte of the sensualyte and owte of mynde of any erthely thynges, thane in gret fervoure of lufe and lyghte of GODD, if oure LORDE vouch-safe, the saule may here and fele heavenly sowne made by the presence of aungells in lovyng of GODD. . . . The soverayne and escencyalle joy es in the lufe of GODD by Hym-selfe, and the secondarye es in commynge and by-haldyng of aungells and gastely creaturs; for ryghte as a saule in undirstandyng of gastely thynges es of ofte sythes³ touched and kennede, thurgh bodyly ymagynacyone by wyrkyng of aungells, (as Ezekiel the profete sawe in bodily ymagynacyone the sothefastenes of GODES preratés,) righte so in the lufe of GODD a saule be the presence of aungells es raveschede owte of all mynde of erthely thynges into a heavenly joye to here aungells saunge and heavenly sowne, efter that⁴ the charyte es mare or lesse. Now than thynke thee that ther may no saule fele verreyly aungell's sange ne heavenly sowne bot it be in perfite charyte, ne hafe noghte felyde it, bot anely that saule that es purede in the fyre of lufe of GODD, that all erthely savoure es brynte owte of it, and all menes lettande be-twyx the saule and the clennes of aungells es brokene and put away fra it. Than sothely may he syng a newe sange, and sothely may he here a blissfulle heavenly sowne and aungells sange with-owtten dessayte or feynynge. Our LORDE wate⁵ where that saule es that for abowndance of brynnande lufe es worthi to here aungells sange. Wha so than will here aungells sange and noghte be dyssayvede by feynynge, ne by ymagynacyone of hym-selfe, ne by the illusyone of the enemy, hym behoves hafe perfite charite. And that es when all vayne lufe and drede, vayne joye and sorowe, es castene owte of the herte, that he lufes na thyng bot GODD, ne joyis, ne sorowes, na thyng bot in GODD

¹ Since.

² Purity.

³ Ofttimes.

⁴ According as.

⁵ Knows.

or of GODD. Who so might by the grace of GODD go this way he sulde noghte erre. Never-the-lattere some mene ere disceyved by thaire awenne ymagynacyone, or by illucyone of the enemy in this matere. Some mane, when he hafe lange travelde bodyly and gastely in dystroyng of synnes and getyng of vertus, and peraventure hafe getyn by grace a somdele ryste and a clereté in concyence, onone¹ he leves prayers, redyngs of Haly Writte, and medytacyons of the Passione of CRISTE, and the mynde of his wrechidnes, and ere he be callede of GODD he gedys his wittys by violence to seke and to be-halde heavenly thynges, (are his eghe be made gastely by grace,) and overtravells by ymagynacyouns his wittes, and by undiscrete travellyng turns the braynes in his hevede,² and for-brekes³ the myghtes and the wittes of the saule and of the body. And thane for febilnes of the brayne hym thynkes that he heres woundirfulle sownes and sanges, and that es no thyng ells bot a fantasie, caused of trubbllyng of the brayne. . . . Also some mene felis in theire hertes as it ware a gastely sowne and swete sanges of dyverse maners. And this es commonly gude, and som tyme it may turne till dissayte. This sowne is felide on this wyse: Some man settis the thoghte of his herte anely in the name of JESU, and stedfastly haldis it thare-too, and in schorte tyme hym thynkes that that name turns hym till gret comforthe and swetnes, and hyme thynkes that the name sownes in is here⁴ delitably as it were a saunge. And the vertu of this likyng es so myghty that it drawes in alle the wittes of the saule thare-to. Who so may fele this sowne and this swetnes verrayly in his herte wite he wile that it es of GODD, and als lange als he is meke he salle noghte be dissayvede. Bot this es not aungells sange, bot it es a saunge of the saule be vertu of the name and by touchyng of the gude aungels. . . . And noghte anely he have comforthe in this, bot also in Psalmes and Ympnes and Antyms of Haly Kyrke, that the herte synges thame swetely, devoutly, and frely with-owttene any travelle of the saule or bitternes, in the same tyme and notes that Haly Kyrke usez. . . . Never-the-lattere in this maner of felyng a saule may be disceyvede by vayne glorie, noghte in that the affeeyone synges to Jhū and loves Jhū in swetnes of Hym, bot eftyrwarde, when it cesses and kelis⁵ of love of Jhū thane entrys in vayne glorie. Tharefore I halde it sekyre that he be meke in his awene felyng, and halde this mynde in regarde noghte till he mowe⁶ be custome and usyng of this mynde fele the fyre of lufe in his affeeyone, and the lyghte of knawyng in his resone.

"Loo! I have tolde thee in this mater a lytill as me thynke, noghte affirmande that this suffishes, ne that this es the sothfastnes in this mater. Bot if the thynke it otherwise, or elles any other man savour by grace the contrarye here-to, I leve the saying, and give stede to hym.

"It sufficeth to me for to lyffe in trouthe⁷ principally, and noghte in felyng."

Throughout this rhapsody a considerable amount of common sense appears. Conscious of a devout enthusiasm in his own soul,

¹ Anon.

⁴ His ear.

⁷ Faith.

² Head.

⁵ Cools.

³ Utterly breaks.

⁶ Is able.

which lifted him up above the world, and made him as it were the companion of angels, the hermit is yet anxious to distinguish what he holds to be the genuine form of this spiritual fervour from false and spurious pretences. Where true charity is lacking, or an indevout life contradicts the spiritual claim, or a disordered brain produces mere illusions, he plainly declares against all pretences to illumination. It is not, then, something independent of the ordinary spiritual graces, but something arising out of and from them, and specially from that highest of all, the love of God. A more rational view this than that of Count Zinzendorf and Swedenborg, or the Böhmenists, Moravians, and Quakers. As a devout and earnest mystic, Richard Rolle would of course exalt the contemplative above the active life, and delight, like other mystics, to epitomise and dissect it. Accordingly one of the longest treatises of his which remains is that "made to an anchores," (the dame Margaret Kyrkby, mentioned before,) on this subject. We have not been able to meet with a copy of this treatise in the pure Northumbrian dialect, but a very early transcript of it is to be found in the Bodleian Library. This MS., which occupies a good-sized folio in the Laud collection,¹ is headed, "The vii. partie of thys boke maad of Rycharde hampole heremyte to an ankeresse." In spite, however, of this title, only two parts are to be found in the MS., in which the contemplative life is treated at great length, and with extreme minuteness.

Our principal reason, however, for adverting to this treatise here is to illustrate the common-sense element which we claim for Richard Rolle, in spite of his mysticism and rhapsodies. We desire to exhibit the hermit not so much in his inner life of contemplation and rapture, as in his outer life of instruction and doctrine to the people. For him to possess any fitness or qualification for this, it was needful that he should be something more than the mere mystic, although his mystical claims would be the most attractive to his auditory. The pure devotee of the contemplative can see in the active life of the world nothing but horror and sin. He recoils from it with loathing, and is quite unable to perceive how any real advance in godliness can be made in this miserable path. Not so, however, the hermit of Hampole:—

"Thou shall understonde that ther ben in Holy Chyrche twey maner of lyves in the whyche cristen men schul bee saaf; that oon² is clepyd actyf, and that other contemplatyf. Without oon of these two may no man be saved. Actyf lyf lyeth in love and cheryte schewyd outward by goude bodili werkys, in fulfillynge of Godis commandmentis, and of the seven dedis of mercy bodili and gostly, to a manys euen cristen.³

¹ 602.

² One. It is interesting to compare this Midland dialect with the Northumbrian, quoted above.

³ To all Christian men.

This lyf langys to alle worldly men, which han rychesse and plente of worldli goude. And al-so to alle other men that han goudis for to spend, lerned or lewid, temporal othere¹ spiritual. And generally al worldly men ben bounden to fulfille [it] bi ther myght and ther kunnyng, ther reson and discrecion. 'If he moche have, moche doo; if he a litell have, litell or lasse do;' and if he nought have, that he have thane a goude wille. There beth workys of actyf lyf othere gostly, othere bodily."

We may observe here that the Hermit has quite the notion of the obligations of property. Active life, according to him, belongs to all those who have goods and temporal possessions. They may serve God in this state as well as the recluse, who having no special ties to oblige him to lead an active life, retires from the world to cultivate divine contemplation and the love of God. We have already quoted the passage from this same treatise in which the Hermit condemns so strongly the notion that the mere outward profession of the religious life could avail anything, and though, as might be expected, he proceeds afterwards to magnify contemplation greatly above the active life, yet he was evidently able to appreciate the duties and responsibilities of what he held to be the lower state, and to understand how religious excellence might be reached therein.

It is mentioned in one of the hymns contained in the Office of Richard Hermit, that his favourite simile was that of the bee. Among the pieces of his Northern English prose, preserved in Archdeacon Thornton's MS., there is one which strikingly illustrates this. Its terse and racy quaintness will not fail to commend it to the reader.

"The bee has three kyndis. Ane es that scho es never ydille, and scho es noghte with thaym that will not warke: bot castis thaym owte and puttis thaym awaye. Anothire es that when scho flyes scho takes erthe in hyr fette that scho be noghte lyghtly over-heghede² in the ayere of wynde. The thyrde es that scho kepes clene and bryghte hire wynges. Thus ryghtwyse men that lufes God are never in ydyllnes; for owthyre thay ere in travayle, prayand or thynkande, or redande, or othire gude doande, or with-takand³ ydyll mene and schewand thaym worthy to be put fra the ryste of Hevene, ffor⁴ thay wille noghte travaile. Here thay take erthe, that es, thay halde tham selfe vile and erthely, that thaybe noghte blawene with the wynde of vanyte and of pryde. Thay kepe thaire wynges clene, that es, the twa commandements of charyte thay fulfill in gud concyens; and thay hafe othyre vertus unblendyde with the fylthe of syne and unclene luste. Aristotille sais that the bees are feghtande agaynes hym that wille drawe thaire hony fra thayme. Swa sulde we do agaynes develles that afforces thame to reve fra us the hony of poure life and of grace, for many are that never have halde the ordyre of lufe thuesche⁵

¹ Or.⁴ Because.² Overturned.⁵ Through.³ Withstanding.

thaire frendys sybbe or fremede.¹ Bot owithre thay lufe tham over mekille, or thay lufe tham over lyttile; settand thaire thoghte unrightwysely on thaym, or thay lufe thaym over lyttile yf thay doo noghte als they wolde till tham. Swylke can noghte fyghte for thaire hony, ffor-thy² the develle turnes it to wormes, and makes theire soules ofte sythes³ full bitter in angwys and tene,⁴ and besynes of vayne thoghtes and other wrechidnes. For thay are so hevy in erthely frenchype that thay may not flee in till the lufe of Jhū CRISTE in the whylke thay moghte wele for-gaa the lufe of alle creatours lyfande in erthe. Wharefore accordantly Arystotill says that some fouheles⁵ are of gude flyghyng that passes fra a land to a-nothire. Some are of ill flyghyng for hevynes of body, and for thaire neste es noghte farre fra the erthe. Thus es it of thaym that turnes them to GODDIS servys. Some are of gude flyehyng, for thay flye fra erthe to hevne, and rystis thaym thaire in thoghte, and are fedde in delite of GODDE's lufe, and has thoghte of na lufe of the worlde. Some are that can noghte flyghe fra this lande, bot in the way late theyre herte ryste, and delyttes thaym in sere⁶ lufes of mene and womene als thay come and gaa, nowe ane and nowe a-nothire, and in Jhū CRISTE thay kan fynde na swetnes, or if thay any tyme fele oghte, it es swa lyttile and swa schorte, for othire thoghtes that are in thaym, that it bringes thaym till na stabylnes. Or thay are lyke till a fowle that es callede Strucyo, or storke, that has wenges, and it may noghte flye for charge⁷ of body. Swa thay hafe undirstandyng, and fastes, and wakes, and semes haly in mens syghte, bot thay may noghte flye to lufe and contemplacyone of God, thay are so charged with othyre affeccyons and othire vanytes."

The dexterous use of similitudes is confessedly one of the greatest elements of success in a popular teacher, and this power Richard Rolle would seem to have possessed in perfection. In a very striking treatise of his, "The Rule of Manis Body,"⁸ we have a most efficient employment made of this weapon. He begins by telling us that "Almighi God seith bi holi Joab⁹ that al mannys liif up-on erthe is fightyng," and then proceeds to enlarge upon the different requirements for the battle,—the horse, arms, and accoutrements, drawing pointed lessons from each. The horse represents the body, and "for sekerli may no knyght fight azens his enemye bot if his horse be to hym buxum and meke." So the soul cannot carry on its warfare against the fiend unless the body be in proper subjection. Again, no knight would think of riding his horse to the combat without a bridle, and if the horse be boisterous and strong, the bridle must be "som-dele sharpe." Now the *bridle* is abstinence, and the two *reins* are the two sorts of temperance, (neither too much nor too little.) These are knit together by the

¹ Kinsfolk or not kin.

² Because.

³ Ofttimes.

⁴ Sorrow.

⁵ Fowls.

⁶ Various.

⁷ Weight.

⁸ MSS. Douce, Bodleian, 13. This is the treatise which has been re-written as "The Gostly Batell," usually ascribed to R. de Hampole, but not his genuine work.

⁹ Saith by holy Job.

knot of good discretion. The *saddle*, which is to enable the knight to sit "sadly" or firmly, is patience and meekness. The knight must also be armed at all points,—he must have a *shield*, which is faith; for as a shield has three corners, and if from each of these be drawn lines into the midst, there will be three triangles, so does it represent faith in the Holy Trinity. He must be furnished with a "*basnet*," which is "helthe," or hope, with "*vambrace*," and "*rerebrace*," and *gloves*, which are "besynes in gostly werkes," with a *girdle*, which is chastity, with the "*jack*" of defence, which is charity, with the *sword* of God's Word, the *spear* of CHRIST'S Passion. A wise knight when he fights will be careful about the *slope of the ground*, the *sun*, and the *wind*. The "*hill*" is good living, the sun is God's grace, the wind is holy prayer. Also he must have a pair of *spurs*, these are the awe and dread of God.

In the treatise called "The Thre Arrows in the Dome,"¹ which is also probably a genuine English work of Richard Rolle, the same power of imagery is used to give additional terror to the awful subject. The "arrows" are the chief penalties inflicted on the great day, and these have divisions and subdivisions of pains, on which all the images of horror are lavished.

The sacred number seven was evidently a topic of much importance with the hermit. We have disquisitions of his on "The seven works of charity," "The seven works of pity," "The seven virtues," "The seven pains of Purgatory," "The seven bleedings of our LORD," "The seven gifts of the HOLY GHOST."² This latter being a characteristic passage, and in the Northern dialect, we propose to quote.³

"The sevene gyftes of the HALY GASTE that ere gyfene to men and wymmene that er ordaynede to the joye of hevene and ledys theire lyfe in this worlde reghtwysely. Thire⁴ are thay: wysdome, undyrstandynge, counsaile, strenghe, counynge, pete, the drede of God. Begynne we at consaile, for thareof es myster⁵ at the begynnynge of oure werkes that us myslyke noghte afterwarde. With thire sevene gyftes the HALY GASTE teches sere mene serely.⁶ (1.) Consaile es doynge away of worldes reches and of alle delytes of all thynges that mane may be tagyld with in thoghte or dede, and with-drawynge in-till contemplacyone of GODE. (2.) Undyrstandynge es to knawe whate es to doo and whate es to lefe. And that⁷ that salle be gyffene to gyffe it to thaym that has nede noghte till other that has na myster. (3.) Wysedom es forgetynge of erthlely thynges and thynkynge of Heven with discrecyone of alle mene dedys. In this gyfte schynes Contemplacyone, that es, Saynt Anstynne says, 'a gastely dede⁸ of fleschely affeccyones thurgh the joye of araysede thoghte.' (4.) Strenghe es lastynge to fulfille gude

¹ MSS. Douce, (Bodleian.) 13. MSS. Harleian (Brit. Mus.) 1137.

² The first four are in the University Library at Cambridge.

³ Thornton MS. Linc. Cath. Library.

⁴ These.

⁵ Need.

⁶ Different men in different ways.

⁷ What.

⁸ Death.

purpose that it be noghte lefte for wele ne for waa. (5.) Pete es that a man be mylde and gaynesay noghte haly writte whene it smyttes his synnys whethire he undyrstand it or noghte, but in alle his myghte purge he the vilté of syne in hyme and other. (6.) Connynges es that makes a man of gude noghte ruysand hyme¹ of his ryghtwysnes bot sorowand of his synnys, and that man gedys erthely gude anely to the honour of God and [more] to other men thane hymselfe. (7.) The drede of God es that we turne noghte agayne till our syne thurgh any ille eggyng, and that es drede perfite in us and gastely when we drede to wrethe² God in the leste syne that we can knawe and fleie it als venyme."

Some of these definitions will doubtless strike the reader as sufficiently strange, and certainly obviousness cannot be said to be the characteristic of the hermit's writings. He was thoroughly versed in the compositions of the great Latin Fathers, and somewhat of that imaginative richness which is so remarkable in their works, may be found in him united with quaint conceits and fancies of his own.

As yet we have said nothing of Richard Rolle's expositions of Scripture, it being difficult to do justice to them in a short space; but as this style of writing may be said to have been his chief employment, next after the treatises on contemplation, they must not be altogether omitted from an attempted account of him. Richard Rolle made both a version of the Psalms in metre, and also a lengthy exposition of them in prose.³ He wrote also Commentaries on Job, Solomon's Song, the Penitential Psalms, and the *Lectiones Defunctorum*. This latter, which is a very curious treatise, is in Latin; MSS. of it are in Lincoln Cathedral Library, and at Cambridge. But perhaps his most characteristic work of exposition is that on the Songs of the Bible. A manuscript of this is in the Bodleian Library.⁴ We subjoin a specimen, that the reader may be able to judge for himself. It is headed "Canticum Ysaie," being a comment on Isaiah xii.

(1.) "'I shal shrife til the LORD, for Thou ert wrethid⁵ til me; turnyd is Thi breth⁶ and Thou me confortyd.' Til the lovyng of The I shal shrife my synne and that I shal do, for Thou ert wrethid til me synnand, and I may noght pay The bot if I for-do my synne thoro shrift, for so Thi breth es turnyd. That is, Thou has turnyd endles pyne⁷ in til short penaunce and in that Thou confortys me delyverand me of bitand consciens and helland in my hert knowyng and felyng of Thi luf.

(2.) "'Lo GOD my SAVEOURE, traistfully I shal wyrke and I shal

¹ Priding himself on.

² Anger.

³ The metrical version is about to be published by the Early English Text Society. There is a copy of it in the library of Eton College. Of the Exposition there are copies in the Bodleian, and at several of the college libraries in Oxford.

⁴ Laud, 286.

⁵ Angered.

⁶ Anger.

⁷ Woe.

not drede, All men beholdis to God.' Jhū CRIST is my SAVEOUR clensand me of synne and delyverand me of tourment; now He me safis turnyd til Hym whom He before blyndid turnyd til the worlde. 'Traistfully I shal wyrke,' that is, I shal boldly say that He shal deme and zeld til ilk man aftur his dede, and 'I shal not drede' to say it thof I be despised of ill men for my sothfastnes.

(3.) "'For my strength in my lovyng LORD is, and made He is til me in heel.' 'My strengt' of whom I am stalworth, that I drede nought, for of my-self I am ful wayk, and my lovyng, whos lovyng I seke in will and worde and werk, nought myn; and He is made til me in heel ageynes Adam that brought me in sekene of deth, and ye that wol folow the fourme of conversacyon,

(4.) "'Ye shal draw waters in joy of the wellis of saucour, and ye shal say in that day, shrifis til LORD and incallis His name.' 'Ye shal draw thoro charite and mekenes watirs of devocyon and of the wysdom of heven in joy zeldand serves til GOD. 'Of the wellis,' that is, of the plenteous yiftys¹ and grace of Jhū CRIST, and ye shal say til othir in that day, that is, when ye drink of the clere wellis and lefis the muddy watirs of erthly lustys: shrifis til LORD your sinnys and so inwardly callis His name, that is, lifis so that your lif shew the lovyng that may no be bot if ye calle His name in til you His wonnyng.² 'Makes knownen in the folk the fyndynges of Him, umthinkis for whi His name is hegh.' 'Makes knownen,' that is, prechis among the folk, that thei may know His imaginacyon thoro the whilk He founde our heel, and that He is found thoro charite in gode werkis; and 'umthinkis,' that is, holdis Him ay in mynde, for His name Jhū is hegh aboven all names, holdis that in your thought and ye shal not falle in til pride, ne conceyt³ GODDIS name as Lucifer and Adam did.

(5.) "'Syngis til LORD, for worshippefully He did; shewys that in all the erth.' Synges til LORD in contemplacyon, for ther-in is delitabull comfort if hit be rygt cald contemplacyon, and ther-with wel wirk and honour Him, for worshipfully He did the heel of men to safe sinful wrechis. What thing is more worshipful then to zeld gode azeyn ill? shewis that worshipful thing among all men, bot namely,

(6.) "'Be glad and love thou wonnyng of Syon, for grete in myddys of the the haligh of Israel.' Thou that wonnys in Syon, that is in holy kyrke and in contemplacyon of GOD and made wonyng of Jhū CRIST. 'Be glad,' that is, shew thee wel cheryd in gode werkis and love GOD that has done so til the, for gret He is in the in luf and vertu He that is haligh of Israel, that is, CRIST halogh and him that is veray Israel in trouth and charite seand GOD."

The expositions of Richard Rolle were not designed to be learned elucidations of the full meaning of the text, but rather practical comments which might be useful to unlettered folk. Thus it is said in the rhyming preface already quoted from, that though in his "Expownyng he fologth holy doctours," yet

"He makes it compendious, short, gode and profitabull,
To mannys soule, GODDIS spouse, in charite to make him stabul."

¹ Gifts.

² Abode.

³ Think of.

Like one who preceded him by about a century, but whose name has not survived, he was truly interested in trying to teach his fellows. This scribe of kindred mind to Hampole says at the beginning of his poem—

“Ut of latin this song is dragen
On engleis speche, on sothe sagen.
Cristene men ogen ben so fagen,
So fueles arn quen he it sen dagen,
Than man hem telled sothe tale
Wid londes speche and wordea smale
Of blisses dune of sorwes dale;
Quhu lucifer that dewel dwale
Brogt mankinde in sinne and bale
And held hem sperd in helles male
Til God arid him in manliched
And halp thor he sag mikel ned.”¹

There can be few points of inquiry more interesting than the endeavour to trace how far religious instruction and practical teaching was brought to bear by the Church upon the unlettered folk in the old English times. Many may be startled at finding an English poet of 1250 professing that he composes a versified account of the earlier books of the Bible in their own language for the benefit of his ignorant fellow-countrymen. This may disclose an amount of care for and attention to Scripture which, in the superficial estimate generally assigned to the Middle Ages, may seem strange. But those who have looked into the subject are well aware that a vast mass of religious and Scriptural teaching of a very early date exists, and that the care for the lewd folk and their enlightenment which was felt by Richard Rolle and by the old writer just quoted was by no means uncommon. Thus, Robert of Brunne (1303,) writes in the beginning of his *Manual of Sins*,

“For lewdé men Y undertoke
On Englyssh tunge to mak thys boke
For many ben of swyche manere
That talys and rymys wyl blethly here.
Yn gamys and festys and at the ale
Love men to lestene trotevale²
That may falle ofte to vylanye
To dedly synne or other folye,

¹ From “*Genesis and Exodus*,” a poem, (date 1250,) published by the Early English Text Society. As the old style is rather unintelligible a translation is appended. “Out of Latin this song is brought into English speech to say sooth. Christian men ought to be as glad as birds are when they see it day, when one tells them a true story in the tongue of the land and easy words, of the height of bliss and the depth of woe; how Lucifer, that apostate devil, brought men into sin and misery, and held them fastened in hell’s mall till God clothed Himself in manhood and helped where He saw great need.”

² Amusing talk.

For swyche men have Y made thes ryme
That they may weyl dyspende here tyme."

Handlyng Synne, Prologue.

And Dan Michel, of Northgate, a contemporary of Richard Rolle (1340,)

"This boc is ymad for lewede men
Ham vor to berge vram alle manyere zen."

Ayenbite of Inwyte.

These writers, like the hermit, were in their day solicitous about the instruction of their fellows, but, like him also, they have almost fallen out of the remembrance of their countrymen; the philological value of their writings having only just saved them from utter extinction.

We have now to say something of the *Office* of the Hermit of Hampole, which, grounded upon the devotions of the people of the North, to his memory and the power of miracle working which it was believed resided at his tomb, was doubtless constructed at the Hampole Priory, to which he was a sort of patron saint. The only MS. which, as far as we know, contains this *Office* is in the library of Lincoln Cathedral.¹ It is a well-written MS. of the fifteenth century, but some of the beginning is so faded from the effect of damp, as to be illegible. Besides the "*Legenda de vitâ S. Ricardi de Hampole heremitæ cum proprio Officio*," it contains three of his Latin treatises, namely those "*De Amore Dei*," "*Super lectiones defunctorum*," and on Psalm xxi. At the end of the MS. is written,—

"Hunc Wodeburgh scripsit Jon. expers criminis hic sit—
Marce precare Deum, ne Ditis tradar ad imum,
Custos esto meus dum dormio nocte Mathæus,
Wodeburgh tu presto Lucas defensor adesto,
Supplico tu dempnes fantasmata cuncta Joannes,
Ore tuo Christe benedictus sit miser iste,
Et prece lectoris relevetur in omnibus horis."

After the heading, "*Officium Ricō Heremitæ*," there follow ten or twelve lines which are quite illegible. Then Psalm xlii. 1, 2. "*Quemadmodum desiderat cervus ad fontes aquarum*," &c. Then follows a panegyric, which is only legible in parts.

"Festum tam inclitum Ricardi præclari predicatoris cananus fortiter
. . . Cuncta carnalia vincens, mundana respuit, quæsit celica, superna
sapuit, magnificâ calens incenditur favilâ, sentit et patitur amoris jacula.

¹ In Hunter's History of South Yorkshire, after a merely conjectural account of Richard Rolle has been given, the writer laments the loss of the *Legenda* and *Officium*, the only copy of which he supposes to have perished in the fire of the Cotton Library. The existence of the Lincoln MS. was quite unknown to this diligent antiquary. (See Hunter's South Yorkshire, I., 358.)

Labor dulcissimus apis eligitur instructor optimus—Mellita loquitur, docet dulcissima; mortalis rapitur factus extaticus in cœlos. Homo seraphicus erat, attentus mente, firmus proposito, constans in opere ejus, in merito divino felix. . . .”

Then a hymn.

“Pange linguâ graciosi Ricardi preconium,
Pii, puri, preciosi, fugientis viciû,
Celsi Dei gloriosi felicitis per premium.

“Famam mundi marcescentem habebat contemptui,
Carnem fecit fatiscentem servire spiritui,
Mundam semper servans mentem bono datam actui.

“Scamnum sibi lecti locus ut [plus] vigil fieret,
Fames [ipsa] sibi cocus ne gula suavesceret,
Odiosus fuit jocus qui boni quid []

“Dum devota meditatur rapitur in nubilum,
Vana cuncta detestatur, reputat in jubilum
Totus Deo

“Deo Patri genitori, laus et ejus genito
Sit [beato] creatori honor pari debito,
Qui Ricardo Confessori cœlum dat pro merito.”

After this, Psalm i. and some canticles were to be recited. Then begins the account of the life of the Saint, each paragraph of which is concluded by a versicle, a psalm, or a hymn. The whole of the hymns are in praise of the sublime spirituality of the Saint, and there is scarce enough variety in the sentiments to make them worth quoting. The following has some little merit as a composition.

“Laudis odas decantemus,
Toto corde jubilemus,
Festum est leticiæ—
Pauper olim heremita
Nunc predives est in vitâ
In statu gloriæ.

“Vitam illam hic mercatus
Carnis tulit cruciatus,
Datus penitentiæ.
Mundi pompas abhorrebat,
Cuncta vana contemnebat
Dono sapientiæ.

“Ardens intus caritate,
Foris fulsit pietate
Docens moris regulam.
Amor thema sit doctrinæ
Et cœlestis disciplinæ
Cor vertens in favilam.

"Miris vita persignata,
Mens mellita, mors invita
Cœlum ei conferunt."

Immediately after the departure of the Saint, we are told, his presence in heaven was recognized by the miracles wrought at his tomb. The list of miracles attributed to him are of the boldest possible type, including several instances of raising the dead to life. We are not concerned to defend the superstition, or the crafty policy which has overlaid the memory of the Yorkshire hermit with these unsightly excrescences. His Office at any rate testifies to the admiration in which he was held in his day, and accords well with the enthusiasm with which his writings were copied, multiplied and dispersed through the land. That he never reached the honours of a legal canonization would little deter the simple Northumbrians from venerating his memory, while the miraculous sanctity attributed to him would give an especial force to his quaint and striking teaching, and make the copies of his lessons for the "unlured and lewed" to be highly prized and carefully preserved.

BRINCKMAN'S ANSWER TO KEENAN.

Keenan's Roman Catholic Controversial Catechism, Examined and Refuted. By the Rev. ARTHUR BRINCKMAN. London: Church Press Company.

It would be impossible to speak of this book save in connection with that to which it professes to be a reply. And this circumstance will be found to constitute its great drawback, because it will serve as an advertisement to Mr. Keenan's larger work, which all persons, who propose to study Mr. Brinckman's book, will be compelled to consult.

Happening ourselves to possess a copy of Mr. Keenan, and feeling how important a matter the supply of proper controversial manuals is, we have been at the pains of comparing the two together. The result is that we believe Mr. Brinckman's book, though undertaken with the best intentions, is a mistake, and we shall not, we think, find much difficulty in establishing this assertion, which we wish to do with much gentleness and consideration.

To begin, therefore, with the Preface and Introduction.

1. We will give Mr. Brinckman's chief motive for answering Mr. Keenan, wherein we discover the root of his mistake to be an inadequate knowledge of human nature, and a somewhat one-sided and illogical argument to prove the need of the present work.

That his book is not intended for Roman Catholics, though written directly in the form of a personal reply, he clearly states in the following—"If Roman Catholics could have been convinced by books, those that have been written by some of our greatest divines would have convinced them." That it is not either meant for the faithful and unwavering members of the Church of England is also clear; for Mr. Brinckman says further, that "there is no objection, argument, or cavil against the Church of England, brought by Roman Catholics of the present day, that has not been examined and refuted times without end." For whom, then, is it written? "For persons wavering in their fidelity to our Church." And these are precisely the persons who stand the smallest chance of getting hold of the book; for assuredly no Roman Catholic under whose notice the weak in faith may fall, would put it into their hands; and far less should *we*, because it would be directly sanctioning the perusal of Mr. Keenan's book, of which the probability is many would not have even heard.

Mr. Brinckman mentions one country parish, where Keenan is in common circulation; but, as a matter of course, under the direction of a Roman Catholic family, who live in the "great house" of the neighbourhood. And then he states that "it is very hard to get any of these would-be Roman Catholics to read any of our authorities or standard works on the question; but they will devour a book like Mr. Keenan's, full of sneers and abuse of the Church they are longing to forsake." Further, our author argues from this, that such persons would, if only for curiosity or excitement, read an answer with nearly as much interest and avidity.

Now here is the point on which Mr. Brinckman's mistake is founded; for, allowing that his Reply might reach some of the wavering—although those who circulated Keenan would not be likely to assist in its reaching them,—we may be quite sure that its perusal would be commenced, not with interest, but with prejudice. For who is not aware that human nature invariably rebels against that which opposes its own wishes? A man, therefore, weak in his faith in the English Church, and already "longing to forsake her," would, even if the arguments in her favour were more powerful, be unwilling to be convinced.

In saying this, we are far from deprecating the publication of controversial manuals: on the contrary, they are very much needed. But they must be done with very great care, and should be complete in themselves, and rather teach truth than confute error.

2. But Mr. Brinckman's Answer is not, we consider, equal in its power to Mr. Keenan's book: and controversy in matters of doctrine, as a rule, even if carried out with power, but too often runs into bitter sarcasm and recrimination, thus strengthening opposition, instead of bringing conviction on either side. For this cause, too, we feel sure that Mr. Keenan's Catechism is compara-

tively harmless ; it is written in too bitter a spirit to convince any temperate person, though it will find many readers among Roman Catholics, and also among the restless and dissatisfied in our own Church who having received imperfect religious instruction, are willing to accept any teaching that promises definiteness of faith. And we think that the eagerness with which such persons fall in with the dogmatic religious teaching of Rome is an evident proof of its necessity to the human mind. There is little doubt, too, that the present state of many in the English Church has arisen from imperfect doctrinal instruction. This is especially felt in the middle classes of society ; whose religious teaching, as Mr. Brinckman justly remarks, has been but too often looked upon as the "least essential part of education," being "confined to half learning the Catechism at Confirmation, and the Collect on Sundays." Beside these there is a large class of persons who simply delight in hearing the Church spoken against.

3. We cannot but regret that our author, though avoiding the bitter and uncharitable tone of Mr. Keenan, has nevertheless adopted a style of sarcasm which we consider cannot fail of damaging the cause it advocates, however honest the motive may be. And again, with all proper feeling for Mr. Brinckman, we are sorry that any one acknowledging to "no scholarship" should venture to engage in so important a controversy as the present. Such undertakings expose us to contumely from the Roman Catholic, and lessen our influence over the weak.

Throughout the book there is unintentionally a flippancy and levity in the style that savours of irreverence, which is sadly out of place. Looking also to the importance of the undertaking, we cannot too strongly disapprove of anything approaching to haste or carelessness in carrying it out. The following passage from the Preface is worse than no excuse :—"I am aware that authors do not keep the promises they make in their prefaces sometimes, so I will say no more on the matter of style, except to beg the reader's pardon for defects in composition, having been pressed for time, having begun to write only on the 12th of this month" (July.) Now as this Preface was dated the 28th, our author could only have allowed himself sixteen days to answer a book which had already reached a circulation of 20,000, and which embraces all the most vital truths of Christianity. There can be no justifiable reason offered for such precipitancy ; but everything to prove rashness. And it seems to us that a man properly impressed with the sacred importance of his subject, would be aware of the risk and irreverence of treating it hastily ; the more especially as Mr. Keenan's book, in its theological character, had the united approval of Bishops and Priests in the Roman Church, which we may be sure would not have been accorded without due and weighty consideration.

As we before said, we wish to be tender in our judgment of Mr. Brinckman, because we cannot but see that his motive is real and Catholic, yet we are compelled to express strongly our vexation at the thoughtlessness and want of judgment which prompted and allowed him to take this responsibility on himself, and further, having done so, to despatch it in sixteen days. Our standard Divines, fully appreciating the hazard of an injudicious step in matters of doctrine, would not have ventured to approach the subject without weighty consideration, and well digested and reverent argument. Clever witticisms and sharp replies may be useful and convenient in conversation, but in a book on theology they are certainly out of place, to say the least.

The two fundamental errors which Mr. Brinckman has made in carrying out his arguments are, we conceive, first, the misunderstanding or misinterpretation of the actual meaning of many of Mr. Keenan's doctrinal statements, and consequent reasoning upon his own half-digested views, instead of taking the true Roman doctrine. This of course is unfair to both sides, for Roman Catholics would not even recognize our author as an opponent worthy of notice; and we cannot but feel that he has laid us open to accusations, either of wilful misconstruction, or of want of spiritual power to discern doctrine.

ii. Mr. Brinckman's arguments are all supported upon second-hand modern authorities, which, though good in their proper places, are nevertheless really many of them not apposite to the purpose intended. Besides, few persons who read his book will be able to consult the authorities to which he refers them, and on which his answer depends. Mr. Keenan, on the other hand, confines himself entirely in matters of doctrine to Holy Scripture and the direct testimony of the early Fathers; and this independently of his own ability and reading decidedly gives him the advantage as a disputant.

We are necessitated, from our limited space, to confine ourselves to a few points in Mr. Brinckman's book.

I. We do not see any advantage in cavilling at Mr. Keenan's statement, that "the gates of Hell shall not prevail against the Church," because it is a truth and a fact, which no one should wish to deny. For, notwithstanding the circumstance that Mr. Keenan may unjustly include the English Catholic with Dissenters and Protestants of every shade, yet in theory we must say with him, that "CHRIST Himself has failed in His Word," if the Church has failed in her purity of doctrine. Abuses of course there have been within her, but they have arisen from individual corruption. The Church, as we understand it, and also as Mr. Keenan does (for his idea of our Catholicity does not affect his theory of the Church as CHRIST'S Body,) is, and always has been, "a glorious Church, without spot or wrinkle, holy, and without blemish;" and however

error and abuses may threaten her destruction, both in her members and from without, yet she will ever be the "pillar and ground of the truth."

We will now give a specimen of Mr. Brinckman's arguing:— "He (R. P., by which he means Mr. Keenan's side,) tries to qualify this (the holiness of the Church,) by saying, the abuses were the work of individual Catholics only, but yet admits the awkward fact. R. P. evidently has some secret conviction in his own mind, that his Church has not been altogether untainted, as appears by the following questions: 'What say the Fathers of the early and purer Church on this subject?' (P. 156.) Why have you said 'that the ancient and *pure* Church administered the Sacrament under one kind?' (P. 188.) 'And again, if they were, the *pure* Church of the first four centuries, would not,' &c. (P. 191.)

Mr. Brinckman here is simply puerile and uncatholic, since Mr. Keenan expresses but the views of all orthodox Churchmen. That in the first centuries the Church was purer in practice, and less distracted by false doctrine, we all acknowledge, while we still believe that the "gates of hell have not prevailed against her." Indeed it appears to us, that great ability is shown by Mr. Keenan in the careful wording of many of his answers on doctrine, thus rendering reply from any English Catholic very difficult.

II. Mr. Brinckman's arguments on faith versus reason, appear also to be ill-grounded. Keenan's contemptuous allusions to the various doctrines of Calvin, Luther, Wesley and Knox, call forth the following lame defence:

"R. P. calls good men like Wesley mad who claim to be guided by the HOLY SPIRIT, and yet what does he recommend to a person to follow in search for the Catholic truth? Why, private judgment, his reason, his head, his heart." And strange to say he comes to this opinion from the following question put by R. P., "'Have you any other *reason* (cause) to induce an honest man to doubt of the reformed religion?'" The title of his book, too, Mr. Brinckman considers encourages private judgment: "Protestantism refuted and Catholicism established by an appeal to Holy Scripture, the Testimony of the Holy Fathers, and the Dictates of Reason." But there is a vast difference between the accordance of our reason with Scripture and antiquity, meant in this title, and the submission of Scripture and antiquity to the fallible decisions of private judgment understood by Mr. Brinckman. We see no inconsistency about this. It is true, as Mr. Keenan says, that "there is nothing ridiculous, gross, absurd, or shameful, which erring reason has not taught:" and yet reason has her proper place.

In the same chapter Mr. Brinckman says, "We have a good many words (in Keenan) to show the Scriptures do not enjoin the

keeping of Sunday. This is not surprising, considering how the Sabbath is profaned in Roman Catholic countries." Doubtless Sunday is very badly observed in many parts of the Continent. But Roman Catholics will not be made ashamed by attempts to prove that Sunday is the Sabbath.

We had gone into all the other chief points of Mr. Brinckman's Reply at considerable length, but in compassion to our readers we withhold what we had written. The faults that we have to find are everywhere the same: *Ex uno disce omnes*.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

We are glad to see that a new edition of the *Lyra Messianica*, (Longman,) has been called for, in which Mr. SHIPLEY has made considerable enlargement. These books together form a really valuable series.

We welcome very cordially a penny *Church Magazine*, published at Birmingham (Locket.) We are convinced that it is in these centres of industry and intelligence that the Church has to do her most important work. Hitherto they have not been brought within the scope of the Church revival, because they have not had the opportunity of learning anything about it. They need not only a special ecclesiastical organization, but also a special literature, of which this little magazine seems a good type.

On the same principle we recommend the *Home Mission Field* and *The Church Builder*. They both speak of the work and the wants of the Church, and are calculated to meet the hitherto unapproached classes: also especially *The Net* (Rivingtons,) of which the editor is Miss ANNE MACKENZIE, sister of the late lamented missionary Bishop. The reports which it contains from foreign lands have all the air of genuineness about them: they have not been doctored by "the Society's" committee.

We have read *Chapters on Animals* (Masters) with great pleasure. There is much that is instructive concerning the habits of animals in the little book. We could wish that "Annie Grant's playmates" were more generally the companions of little girls and boys, for we think that much of the evil arising from bad example during the playhours of children would be thus avoided. The habit of kindness to and consideration for animals would also become a more prominent feature in the character of persons generally.

We recommend Mr. PHILLIP's little book, *Your Duty and Mine*, (Rivingtons,) as containing most useful advice. The due fulfilment of

the various domestic duties is one of the first *results* of our incorporation into CHRIST; in other words, we do not ascend from the due performance of moral and social duties to the apprehension of religious dogmatic truth. Rather we do not truly understand the relations in which we stand to one another until we have taken in the whole mystery of the Incarnation and its results. The chapter on wives and husbands is especially good and Catholic.

A reprint of Bishop Andrewes' *Private Prayers* in the good Bishop's own Latin, (Rivingtons,) is MR. MEYRICK'S last contribution towards the enlightenment of continental Christendom. It is, we think, the first publication of a devotional kind that has been issued, and a better could not have been selected.

The editor of the *Cottage Commentary* on the Gospels (Masters) is now proceeding to illustrate the Epistles; but for some reason unexplained he has begun at the end, and in his first volume takes the Epistle to the Hebrews and those which follow it. The devotional temper of the writer marks every page; but we could wish that there was more of the directly dogmatic and critical in the Commentary. We do not deny that what is most important in these departments may be picked out by a well instructed reader: but in a work designed for "cottagers" it should lie on the surface, for it is dogmatic teaching that we most need.

We have read with much interest the Dean of Westminster's Sermon preached at the anniversary of "The Foundation of Westminster Abbey," (Parker.) Of course Dr. Stanley treats the subject according to his accustomed manner; but upon the whole there is more of a reverential tone about it than might have been expected. We are glad to find that the Dean promises a larger work on the history of the Abbey. In constructing it we hope that he will be a little more careful of the rights of property, and not, as in his Memorial of Canterbury Cathedral, claim for a discovery of his own what any one may find in the pages of Lingard.

We call attention to a very important undertaking advertised by Messrs. Clarke, of Edinburgh, to be commenced immediately,—it is nothing less than the Translation of the whole of the Ante-Nicene Fathers, to be comprised in about sixteen or eighteen volumes, at the very moderate price to subscribers of four 8vo. volumes for one guinea. The names of two responsible editors are given, and we trust that they will see that the English is more idiomatic than many translations from the German have been.

We trust that MR. LYTLETON and his friends will not be offended if we say that they have undertaken too difficult a work in attempting a series of Sermons on the Holy Communion. The writer to whom was committed the "Doctrine" of the Holy Eucharist seems to us to have very decidedly failed in his definition of the Sacrifice, and the editor in an appendix, which is still more compromising in its character, has made yet greater confusion.

The Bishop of BRECHIN has published a new edition of his very valuable Treatise on the Nicene Creed, (Parker,) which is so increased in size as almost to be capable of being considered a new work.

Mr. SHIPLEY, we are glad to see, has given us another instalment of Avrillon's Meditations. (Masters.) They are for the Seasons of Ascension and Whitsuntide.

Mr. MILNER, who seems always ready armed for controversy, has issued a telling little tract on the Sabbath Question, (Brown and Co., Aberdeen,) which is creating so much stir at this time among the Scotch Presbyterians. The ventilation of the subject will act beneficially we are sure also upon ourselves.

We appreciate the design of Mr. STONE's *Lyra Fidelium*, (Parker,) which is the name chosen for a series of short poems on the several Articles of the Creed, and can award him a considerable meed of praise for its execution. But were it more perfectly fitted to be, what its author proposes to himself, viz., a manual for the use of the poor, so would it be necessary that it should be a penny tract, and not a half-crown volume.

The Every Day Companion, (Parker,) by Mr. RIDLEY, is a manual of devotion differing from "Daily Steps" only in this, that to the text selected for the day are appended a few words of meditation and the verse of a hymn. A second part is to follow.

We have seldom read anything more feeble, and at the same time more mischievous than the Charge of Mr. PREST, whom the Bishop of Durham has fetched up from some unknown region to be his Arch-deacon. The object of the Charge is to excite the passions of the Protestant public by quotations from Lord Russell's famous Durham Letter and by other artifices; but it is not likely to succeed. Of course it is very natural for the Irish clergy who congregate about Birkenhead to rave,¹ and it is very nice for Dr. Blakeney, one of their number, to get a good salary as an itinerant lecturer, but there must be some more reputable leaders than have yet appeared, or every one who has a character to lose will back out of the movement, as we learn that the Bishop of London, finding that the Government will not support him, has already done. The part of the Charge however that we really quarrel most with, is that which would make us believe that the Church is really doing her work in Durham. The fact is that no diocese, we believe, is in a more depressed condition. The Bishop makes clergy of the lowest of the people who respond to his Shibboleth, and the only real life in the diocese, save where one or two great proprietors have built churches, is what the Ecclesiastical Commissioners are doing for those parishes from whence their income is very largely derived.

¹ At a recent meeting at Birkenhead, out of about fifteen clergy present, eight were Irishmen and two Germans.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE NEW EDITION OF SANCTA CLARA.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—Having favourably reviewed my edition of “*Sancta Clara*,” in your December Number, you have thought fit to give admission in that for January to a somewhat carping attack from an anonymous correspondent. This, I believe, is unusual both with your own, and with other magazines. With regard to that attack permit me to state, that I did not propose to myself to alter Davenport’s book (as your correspondent seems to imagine I ought to have done,) but to provide a *verbatim* reprint for the many who desired to possess it. An expurgated edition, as it seems to me, would have been of little value to any one.

Notwithstanding this disappointment of your anonymous correspondent, I have good reason to know that the volume complained of—upon which I spent much time and labour—has been very favourably received both publicly and privately by those whose opinion I value, yourself amongst the number.

With regard to the quotation from S. Augustine, it should be remembered that Cardinal Bona and Bellarmine, Antonius Possivinus, S. Bonaventure, and Passaglia, agree with “*Sancta Clara*,” and are opposed to the opinion of my critic.

Your obedient servant,
FREDERICK GEORGE LEE.

19, Coleshill Street, London, Jan. 13, 1866.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

DEAR SIR,—Thank you for showing me Mr. Lee’s letter. I certainly did not intend to write in a “carping” spirit, but I felt and still feel that it is to be regretted that Mr. Lee should not have followed the example set by the editors of the “Anglo-Catholic Library,” and other recent reprints, and so have verified all the references in “*Sancta Clara*’s” book. This seems to me to be a principle that should guide all editors. Had he done this, I do not think he could have let the quotation from S. Augustine pass without comment. But independently of this result, it is due to any writer of consideration to ascertain if his authorities are rightly quoted, whether there be any errors of the press to be corrected, or whether recent discovery should in any way modify his statements or reasoning.

I am, dear Sir,
Yours obediently,
M. A.

WORDSWORTH'S COMMENTARY ON THE BIBLE.

The Holy Bible ; with Notes and Introductions. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Canon of Westminster. Genesis and Exodus. London : Rivingtons. 1864.

IT is abundantly evident that there is urgent need of a new commentary on Holy Scripture. The New Testament has indeed of late years engaged the attention of some of the best read scholars of the day, and their editions of the Greek text and of various portions of the Epistles are monuments of accurate learning and unwearied diligence. But we lack a continuous commentary on the Bible as a whole and of the Old Testament in particular. The press has poured forth a flood of lucubrations of Literalists, Pantheists, Protestants, Neologians, and sermonizers, but an edition of the sacred text with the exegesis of a sound Catholic scholar, possessing a firm grasp of doctrine, a reverent regard for antiquity, a ripened familiarity with the original languages of the Scriptures, combined with a discreet appreciation of the discoveries of modern science, and an acquaintance with the chief objections of modern infidels, is still a *desideratum*. That the varied acquirements demanded for such a task should meet in any one man, is perhaps scarcely to be expected ; that the majority of late commentators are deficient in many of the most essential qualifications, is unfortunately only too apparent. At the same time the labours of scholars in their own special departments, though commonly directed to an illegitimate object and informed by an erroneous judgment, have cleared the way for the more efficacious exertions of the orthodox theologian ; while the outrageous attacks of unblushing infidels, and the secret minings of insidious friends, have given an impulse to the study of Scripture which must be satisfied in a proper and sufficient degree, if the appetite thus created is to tend to health and truth. In many important particulars Dr. Wordsworth seems to be eminently fitted for a guide to the interpretation and defence of the sacred records. It would be difficult in all England to find half a dozen as generally well qualified as he for the labour of love in which he is engaged. Individual scholars might treat special points more ably and thoroughly, but few could be found to equal Archdeacon Wordsworth in general fitness for the gigantic task. If there are some points upon which we disagree with him, and would desire to see him maintain other views ; if his late conjunction with some of the most notorious of the Puritan party in an attack on ritualism has given a rude blow to our confidence in his judgment and appreciation of Catholic doctrine ; on the other hand it must be remembered that we cannot

expect perfection, and that it is a great gain to find a commentator who really is well acquainted with, and has due reverence for, the Fathers of the Church, and who, if he has been left somewhat behind in the Catholic development of opinion and practice, is yet sound on the great verities of our faith, has no Germanising predilections, and is bold and unflinching in the enunciation of truths which modern Protestants decry. No one can deny these qualifications to the present author; and we therefore welcome the appearance of his work as likely to prove of lasting utility, and as affording a favourable specimen of Anglican scholarship and research.

The present volume is the first instalment of a work which, if ever completed, will take rank with the invaluable commentaries of such painstaking and indefatigable writers as Walafrius Strabus, Menochius, Tirinus, and Cornelius à Lapide. With Dr. Wordsworth's edition of the New Testament our readers have long been acquainted. The present volumes are brought out in the same form as the previous ones, with this difference, that instead of giving the text of the original at the head of the notes, the authorized English Version is printed, and the work is thus made available to multitudes whom the appearance of the Hebrew would have repelled from its perusal. With this single exception the two portions of the undertaking are identical in character. There is the same constant appeal to the Fathers, the same diffuseness of style, the same reference to the attacks of English and German rationalists, the same undisputed loyalty to the Anglican Church, and the same disposition to stop short of the enunciation of what most readers of the *Ecclesiastic* hold to be the highest doctrine. But however some might be inclined to wish a few statements here to be modified, and a stronger appreciation of certain aspects of doctrine there to be exhibited, the commentary on the whole deserves the warmest approbation, and will add another and an enduring link to the chain of benefits which binds Dr. Wordsworth to the whole English Communion.

The Preface to the whole work sets forth distinctly the main object of the Commentary, which is to exhibit the oneness of the Old and New Testaments, the centre point of both of which is CHRIST. This is followed by an Introduction, which discusses two questions, The Inspiration of the Old Testament generally, and The Unity and Authorship of the Pentateuch. These two subjects, on which so much has been written of late years, and which the friends of truth have done much to mystify and embarrass by untenable arguments and ambiguous common-places, Dr. Wordsworth reduces to manageable dimensions by maintaining that it is useless to attempt to separate the earlier Scriptures from the later. The inspiration of the former must depend upon the testimony of the

other. To one who disbelieves in the Divine Nature of CHRIST, you cannot allege the sanction given by Him and His Apostles. Therefore, in dealing with sceptics, you must act as the early Church did with Jews and unbelievers, and convince them that CHRIST is GOD, before you can hope to prove that the histories which they regard as untrustworthy, contemptible, or allegorical, are accounts of events which really happened, and are rife with Divine mysteries. In other words, the evidences of Christianity must be examined by the fair opponent of the inspiration of the Old Testament. Granting the Divinity of CHRIST, no one can hesitate to acknowledge the Divinity of the earlier Scriptures. Their reception by the Jews, the Apostles, the Church in an unbroken line to this present time, forms only an additional evidence which is indeed not needed if the primary fact be allowed. This is our author's argument, and it is sound and weighty. How much rather it befits the Christian apologist thus to argue, than with many well-meaning writers to attempt to prove the inspiration of the sacred text from the bare letter, any reader may judge who will compare Dr. Wordsworth's reverent yet bold and manly treatment of the great subject, with the timid, apologetic tone of those who reason as non-Christians or unbiassed students.

The discussion of the "Unity and Authorship of the Pentateuch," is, we think, less successful than that of the first question. We have no doubt that the conclusions arrived at are correct, that there is a certain unity in the Five Books, and that Moses is the author of all but an insignificant portion of them, but the arguments from which these inferences are drawn seem wanting in cogency and distinctness. For instance, we are told that the Pentateuch is "One Book in Five Parts," originally written on one roll composed of skins of parchment attached successively to one another, and placed in the Tabernacle near the Ark. And the authority for this last statement is Deut. xxxi. 9 (and we suppose ver. 26 :) "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi," &c. But "this law" surely means Deuteronomy, not the whole Pentateuch, though we are aware that some commentators have imagined that more is meant. At any rate, the point is so uncertain that no argument can fairly be grounded upon it. Further, Dr. Wordsworth asserts that the Pentateuch is called "The Book of the Law," or "The Law of Moses;" while the fact is, that the term "The Law" is used in other senses, sometimes narrowed to the Ten Commandments, and sometimes extended to include the Psalms, as in S. John x. 34, at other times to embrace the Prophets (1 Cor. xiv. 21,) and even the whole of the Old Testament (S. John xii. 34.)

Another argument is that the Books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers all begin with the Hebrew conjunctive particle *vau*, which knits them together into one whole. So far from this circumstance

being singular in the case of the various members of the Pentateuch, it would be an exception to find any historical book in the Old Testament which did not thus begin. Others of the reasons adduced are not more cogent than the above; many of them go to prove that the Pentateuch is the work of one Divine mind, but by no means serve to show that it was composed by one human author. The only arguments that really bear on the question of the unity of these Books are mere statements, treated in the most cursory manner, such as the idiomatic peculiarities found equally distributed through the five volumes, the sameness of style discoverable therein, &c. These points of internal evidence needed careful and full treatment, and it is matter of regret that they have not received the attention which they required. The virulent assaults on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch certainly demand the attention of the Christian apologist. The theories which make these Scriptures a kind of religious romance, with no pretension to historical accuracy, or else a mere collection of fragments and traditions, put together in an inartificial shape by some later author or authors, claim determined opposition and careful refutation, because the truth of the Pentateuch is inseparably connected with the truth of Christianity itself. The Document-Hypothesis (as it has been called) may be true or false; at any rate it has been made to account for the diversity in the use of the names Elohim and Jehovah, of which so much has most unnecessarily been made, and does not in any degree militate against the inspiration, authority, or unity of the Pentateuch. No one supposes that S. Matthew was uninspired because he introduces into his Gospel a genealogical list, obtained, it may be, from ordinary sources; and a more careful investigation of the manner in which the different names of God are employed proves that they are selected on certain intelligible principles, and have some definite relation to the context wherever they occur. To this point we shall recur shortly.

There can be no doubt that Dr. Wordsworth has taken the right course for interpreting the Old Testament. To see CHRIST in all Scripture,—to look through the letter to the spirit,—to view all the events therein narrated in their bearing on the Incarnation and Atonement of the Son of God,—are the fundamental principles by which the Catholic commentator must be guided. Those unhappy men who boast of treating the Bible like any common book willfully reject the only means of understanding the sacred records. The Bible is a book *sui generis*, and its interpretation requires other studies than grammar, geography, history, ethnography, and other dispositions than captious unbelief and crude criticism.

“In order to read the Old Testament with benefit, we must begin our studies with the New,” says Dr. Wordsworth. “In order to un-

derstand what was the mind of the HOLY SPIRIT, when He wrote the Book of Genesis and Exodus, and the rest of the Pentateuch, we must listen carefully to the interpretations given of them by JESUS CHRIST, the SON of GOD, and by His Apostles, to whom He sent the HOLY SPIRIT in order 'to teach them all things,' and 'to guide them into all truth,' and 'to bring all things to their remembrance which He Himself had spoken unto them.' Not only the comments which JESUS CHRIST and His Apostles made on the Old Testament are to be noted with reverent attention, but every suggestion and hint which they give, every clue that they supply, is to be thankfully accepted by the expositor of the Old Testament. He will listen to every whisper which the HOLY SPIRIT breathes by their lips."—Pp. vi., vii.

These are words of wisdom, and at once show that the present commentary is distinguished from many of its predecessors and contemporaries by a reverent appreciation of the one system which pervades all God's revelations.

Leaving the consideration of the introductory portion, and turning to the commentary itself, we are landed at once in the region of geological controversy. The creation of the world has ever been, and will always be, a subject of debate, where the only safe position for the believer is an attitude of calm confidence in the truth of the Word of God, and of patient waiting for further enlightenment. In elucidating the first three verses of Genesis, Dr. Wordsworth maintains that vast periods of time elapsed between the events therein recorded. In the beginning of time God created the heavens, and the angels, and the earth in which we now dwell, though not in its present condition. During this period of unlimited duration, the various changes in the surface of the earth and the various successions of plants and animals, to which the discoveries of geology bear witness, may probably be supposed to have taken place. This, which appears to be the most likely solution of the geological puzzle, is not fully brought out by Dr. Wordsworth: it is just hinted, and that is all. The period above mentioned was followed by a convulsion or catastrophe, which reduced the earth (not the heaven) to the condition in which it is described as "without form and void." This ruin, Dr. Wordsworth, in common with many Fathers, regards as attributable to the agency of "the angels who kept not their first estate," "who were permitted by Almighty God, for His own wise purposes of a greater manifestation of His glory in a new creation, to exercise their desires and powers for evil in damaging His work of creation, and to mar the structure of the earth as originally made by Him." The discoveries of geology prove that death already existed upon the earth ages before man's appearance upon this scene. There is nothing to show that the inferior creatures of the new creation were not subject to the now universal law. God's threat, "Thou shalt surely die," extended to man under certain conditions that doom which mysteriously

pre-existed. But concerning the stupendous history that was enacted before the six days of creation the sacred record is silent, and only few and scattered gleams are cast upon the utter darkness by some isolated expressions and allusions in the later scriptures. Its tremendous consequences, its ineffaceable vestiges, we experience and we trace; but the course of events we can only see darkly, and are soon lost in a maze of conjecture, from which the Bible offers no escape. Quitting the consideration of the indefinite period that elapsed before the production of light by the word of the Almighty FATHER, we are met with so many questions of interest and difficulty in the actual work of the Hexaëmeron, that we can select only a few for notice. And first, as to the determination of the length of the six days of creation, Dr. Wordsworth affords little assistance. He is satisfied with saying that Hugh Miller's theory (though he does not himself adopt it) is worthy of respectful consideration, but grounds his rejection of it on the analogy of the occurrence of the Resurrection of CHRIST and the Descent of the HOLY GHOST on the first day of the week, which, however valuable as illustration or mystery, is scarcely to be considered an argument. There is no doubt that the Authorized Version, "And the evening and the morning were the first day," would be better rendered as in the margin, "And the evening was, and the morning was;" or, better still, "And there was evening, and there was morning;" or as Kurtz takes it,¹ "It became evening, it became morning." The expressions seem to imply that a day had preceded the evening, the day of creation commencing with the morning, and are not to be assumed as equivalent to the Greek *πρωτὴν ἡμέραν*. Rather, as the author above referred to observes, there is noted a regular succession of time. First appears light, then evening, then morning, in natural sequence. But the question of the duration of each of the six days must be settled upon other grounds. A careful and critical examination of the language of verse 5 will show that "day" implies a division of time defined and caused by the presence of light. Whether before the appearance of the sun the "days" were limited exactly to twenty-four hours cannot be determined. The laws which regulated the change of light and darkness during the first three days are unknown to us. All that is discoverable is that the sacred narrative measures the duration of "the day" by the natural divisions, day and night, evening and morning, and that from the fourth day onwards, after the law was given that the sun should rule the day and the moon the night, there is no ground for believing that any different order existed from that which now prevails. Indeed, we believe it has been carefully computed that the only point of coincidence where day, month, and year would all start together, occurs B.C. 4005,

¹ History of the Old Covenant, vol. i. p. xxi. Eng. Transl.

within one year of the usual chronology adopted in our Bibles.¹ Of course, unless the days of creation were natural days, this curious and interesting result could not have been obtained. The difficulty of the formation of the sun on the fourth day, while light had already been created on the first, Dr. Wordsworth overcomes by a reference to the original. Light (*or*) was revealed on the first day, but it was stored up in the sun (*maor*, a receptacle for light) on the fourth: "the luminaries, therefore, are not the cause or fountains of light, but merely the receptacles or magazines of light previously made, and the channels of it to men."² It must be observed further, though Dr. Wordsworth omits specially to notice it, that the sacred narrative does not state that the sun, moon, and stars were created on the fourth day: it merely assigns their relation to the earth. What they are in themselves, what other uses they subserve, what may have been their connection with other systems, we are not told. In saying that God set them in "the firmament," (*rakiah*,) the terrestrial sky, the Scripture manifestly speaks of their adaptation to certain purposes of our globe, and enters not at all into the subject of the ends they may serve independently of our sphere. The Bible confines itself to their application to this earth, and leaves all other questions about them unanswered. In connection with this matter, and as a specimen of our author's spiritual and analogical treatment of the history, we may quote the following:—

"Light existed from eternity in the inexhaustible Fountain of light, the Godhead Itself. But in process of time it pleased God to set certain luminaries, certain spiritual *Meoroth*, to be channels of Divine *Or*, or Light, in the heaven of His Church. These are His Word and Sacraments. But God can and did give light and grace before them and *without* them. It was a long time before a word of Scripture was written. He gave the HOLY GHOST to Cornelius *before* Baptism. And the time is coming when God will lighten His people *without* the light of the Sun in the heavenly City, 'which has no need of the sun nor of the moon to shine in it; for the glory of God doth lighten it,' and the Lamb is the Light thereof,' (see Rev. xxi. 23; Isa. lx. 19, 20,) and His saints will see Him face to face, and know even as they are known (1 Cor. xiii. 12.)"

Before we quit the so-called scientific portion of the sacred story, we must pause a few moments to exhibit Dr. Wordsworth's view of that much discussed subject and fruitful source of objections, the Deluge. This he has treated with much fulness; and in a preliminary note he has gathered in one general survey the remarks scattered through the commentary upon chaps. vi.—ix. As to the historical fact of the Flood, he is content to rest his argument on

¹ See *Literary Churchman* for 1863, p. 214, reviewing Mr. E. Gresswell's *Three Witnesses*.

² On ch. i. 14.

the testimony of CHRIST. Our Blessed LORD delivers to us the Old Testament as true; He also teaches us to believe in the history of the Deluge. (S. Matth. xxiv. 37; S. Luke xvii. 26.) To deny, therefore, the truth of the record is to disbelieve CHRIST. As to the universality of the Flood, which he asserts uncompromisingly, Dr. Wordsworth alleges four chief arguments, the cogency of which, however, is far from being great. 1. The plain language of Scripture, Gen. vii. 19—23; upon which it is obvious to remark that, unless we imagine that the whole globe was already peopled, (which nobody has assumed,) the expression “all flesh died that moved upon the earth” applies merely to the inhabited parts; and the further words, “All the high hills that were under the whole heaven were covered,” might well refer to the mountains in sight from the ark, or may well be considered one of those hyperbolical expressions, like *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη* of the LXX. and the New Testament, many of which are found in the Bible, as in all Oriental writings. (Comp. S. John xxi. 25.) The reader must observe that we have no wish here to argue against the universality of the Deluge; we merely desire to point out where the reasoning is inconclusive, and this because incalculable mischief is done to the cause of truth on the one hand by founding assertions upon weak arguments, and on the other by making that to be an article of faith which neither Scripture nor the Church have presented to us as infallible. 2. God’s promise to Noah, repeated to Isaiah (liv. 9,) that the earth should not again be destroyed by a flood, which, if it was only partial, has failed, inasmuch as countries have often since been submerged by local floods. This, again, is inconclusive, because the Deluge, if confined to one portion of the globe, may well be considered as general in its effects, as destroying all the then race of men. The covenant of the rainbow has been fulfilled, in that the whole human race has never again been subject to this visitation. (The argument from the language of S. Peter, II. ii. 5, and II. iii. 5, 6, that the whole earth is in both cases the subject of the Apostle’s proposition, is of little force, owing to the above considerations.) 3. The universality of Christian Baptism, of which the Flood is confessedly the type. Christian Baptism is not local or partial; therefore its type was not. Inconclusive again. Baptism applies to all men: the Deluge, whether universal or not, affected all men. 4. The entire destruction of the earth by fire at the last day, which is the antitype of its destruction by water. Here, too, there is a flaw in the reasoning; for how can the future antitype *prove* a particular view of a past historical event? It may be very true; the analysis may be striking and instructive; but what objector would give it a moment’s consideration? The past preaches of the future, it is true; but the future cannot in the eyes of gainsayers prove the past. Another argument, not mentioned by Dr. Wordsworth, that a mass of water thirty

feet above the top of Ararat, itself nearly 17,000 feet high, prevailing for a year over the earth, would have found its level and covered all the globe, may be answered in two ways. First, as there are mountains of various heights more elevated than Ararat, extending, we believe, to 29,000 feet above the sea-level, the supposed rise of the waters would have been more than two miles below their summits. And secondly, whereas the usual course of nature was miraculously interfered with to produce the Deluge, the same Almighty power may have restrained it to certain definite limits, within which its operations were needed for the special purpose of punishment. If these are all the arguments that can be brought forward to support the opinion of the universality of the Deluge, we think it would be wiser to abstain from dogmatising on the subject at all. Let us be content to suspend our judgment in this case, and neither to regard as heretics and rationalists those who think they have discovered facts which militate against the assumed universality, nor claim for our own cherished opinions the merit of being the only possible explanation of the difficulty.

The number of animals in the ark, and their support during their long confinement after the LORD had "shut them in," have been and always will be fruitful sources of controversy and speculation. Dr. Wordsworth thinks that the countless species of animals that now exist (computed at 1,500 mammalia, 6,000 species of birds, and 100,000 species of reptiles and insects) have been developed from a much smaller number of original types, and that these primitive kinds alone entered the ark; considering also that the same holds good of the animals to whom Adam gave names in Eden, as it is manifestly impossible to believe that the first man named all the now existing species of animals in the space between his own creation and that of Eve. He supports this opinion by the account of S. Peter's vision in the Acts, where it is said that the sheet contained *πάντα τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*, arguing that, as it is most improbable that the figurative vessel contained the enormous number of existing animals, but that yet the language both here and in Genesis is identical, it is therefore reasonable to assume that only the types of different families of animals were included in both cases. If more is wanted, Dr. Wordsworth proceeds, we must remember that the whole history of the ark is the history of miracle, and, believing this, we need not inquire too curiously into details, but be satisfied that He Who ordered the miracle ordered also the events and circumstances to produce the intended effect, and to obviate all natural impediments to His purpose. No one can read this portion of the Commentary without acknowledging the author's faith and trust, his entire belief in the Divine Record, and the entire absence of any suspicion that the details of the history may fairly be questioned by any true Christian. And we sympathise

fully with his inability to enter into the objections made against the sacred narrative, and to place himself in the objector's position. At the same time we cannot but feel that, owing to this insensibility, many objections lose their full force, and many important refutations are left unsaid. The mode of treatment adopted would never convince the sceptic, however it might edify the believer.

On the vexed question of the use of the names of God, *Jehovah* and *Elohim*, Dr. Wordsworth is very satisfactory. This subject has, as our readers know, given rise to endless disputes, arguments, document-theories, &c., but is really only deserving of the appellation of what would be termed in profane matters a mare's nest. That there is good and sufficient reason on every occasion for the employment of either word is capable of abundant proof. The name written in our Bibles "*Jehovah*" implies self-existence and unchangeableness; it might be translated, *THE BEING*. *Elohim*, translated God in the Authorised Version, is probably derived from a word meaning *to be strong*, and might be rendered, *THE MIGHTY ONE*; its plural form may express plurality of Persons and of attributes. The rationalistic theory is that the use of these two words for the same notion implies different authors and different epochs; the adoption of "*Elohim*" marking an earlier, and of "*Jehovah*" a later writer; whereas the simple solution is that the former term designates God in His relation to all the world, the latter in His relation to the covenant-people. The following quotations from Dr. Wordsworth will put the matter in a clear light:—

"These names of God have a deep spiritual meaning, and are not used arbitrarily, but with a well-defined moral relation to the subject. . . . There is a remarkable significance in the manner in which the name of God is used in the narrative. [Gen. xx.] Abimelech, as one who was not a member of the covenanted family, is represented in relation to *Elohim* (v. 3,) *the* true personal God,—*Elohim*, with the article,—appears to him (v. 6.) Abraham addresses a prayer to *ha-Elohim* (*the* one true personal God, v. 17;) and it is God, as *Jehovah*, the LORD and SAVIOUR of the covenanted seed, Who interposes to deliver Abraham, the head of the covenanted family, and to preserve the purity of Sarah, the mother of Isaac, the promised seed, who was to be the forefather of CHRIST." (On ch. xx. 18.)

"The word *Lord* is here [xxi. 1] used, and in ver. 2 we have the name *God*; and thenceforth through the chapter we have *Elohim* until the end (ver. 32,) where we read that Abraham called on the Name of the LORD, the *Everlasting God*. . . . The Blessed Virgin Mary, in her *Magnificat*, which is grounded on that of Sarah in this chapter, joins both titles in the same verse, but each title has its proper meaning. 'My soul doth magnify *the Lord*, and my spirit rejoiceth in *God my SAVIOUR*, for He hath regarded the low estate of His handmaiden,' (the handmaid of *the Lord*, i. 38;) 'for, behold, from henceforth all

generations' (whom God, the God of the spirits of all flesh, hath made) 'shall call me blessed.' The name *Lord* represents her specially in her relation to *Jehovah*, the LORD of the chosen and covenanted people: the word *God* describes her in her relation to *all nations*, who are blessed in her seed." (On ch. xxi. 1.)

The principle of interpretation followed by Dr. Wordsworth is, as we have previously intimated, to read the Old Testament by the light of the New. He sees types and figures everywhere. The history is, in his view, only the outer clothing of the inward verity. In the reaction from the merely historical treatment of the Pentateuch, with which we are all familiar, some may think that the present commentator has allowed himself to be led into excesses in his zeal for typical interpretation. In the eyes of men to whom the idea of a type is abhorrent it would be easy to substantiate charges of extravagance and puerility. That an event or a ceremony should really be inexplicable until regarded by the light cast upon it by its antitype in the Christian dispensation, is to many minds monstrous and absurd. There are persons who are able to explain everything to their own satisfaction, ponderously elucidating this, airily skipping over that, and all the time utterly unconscious that they are leaving untouched the real point; gravely discussing the appearance and uses of the shell, but never arriving at the hidden kernel. The literal meaning had, and has, its special purpose. There are lessons for all time to be drawn from it. The practical bearing of events is worthy of deepest attention. The delineation of character, and the moral aspect of things, are points which the literal account plainly exhibits; and doubtless a commentator who neglects this side of Scripture so far makes his exegesis imperfect. But no commentary ever yet was sufficiently full in all respects. One mind cannot attend equally to all parts. It is only natural that the due proportion should occasionally fail, and that the writer should lay the greatest stress upon that view to which his reading or idiosyncrasies peculiarly incline him. Dr. Wordsworth avowedly occupies himself with the spiritual meaning of the Scriptures which he is illustrating. He interprets them allegorically, morally, and anagogically; that is, he shows how the Old Law receives its significance and development in the New Law, what lessons for life Christians may deduce from the narrative, what bearing it has upon things celestial. If, in executing this design, he sometimes seems to make the spiritual sense assume undue proportion, by this means dwarfing the literal or absolutely ignoring it, he is following the steps of the greatest Fathers of Scriptural exegesis, all of whom hold that Scripture was written *ab intus*, from the inward mystery, not *ab extra*, with a mystical sense inserted. We have had enough of modern criticism from the opposite view, and may well receive with satisfaction a commentary which vindicates

true Christian interpretation, and restores it to its legitimate position. As a favourable instance of the minuteness of Dr. Wordsworth's explanations we may quote the following:—

“We are taught by CHRIST Himself that the manna was a type of Himself (S. John vi. 40—51,) and see what is said by S. Paul (1 Cor. x. 1, 3, 6.) I. The manna came from heaven. So CHRIST. II. When it came down, it was covered with dew [Ex. xvi.] ver. 13, 14. So CHRIST, with the dews of GOD'S HOLY SPIRIT. It is described as ‘small,’ and ‘divested of its covering.’ [So Dr. Wordsworth renders the word translated ‘small’ A.V. Its derivation would certainly authorise this rendering.¹] May not the word there used represent figuratively the character of CHRIST, the true manna, in His Incarnation and Coming down from heaven, when He divested Himself of the glory which He had in heaven, and appeared upon earth, and made Himself little in man's eyes, and of no reputation, and humbled Himself, and took on Him the form of a servant? See Phil. ii. 7, 8. Compare the remarkable text (S. John xiii. 3) where JESUS, the true manna, feeds His disciples, and *lays aside His garments*, and teaches humility. The word, as applied to the *literal* manna, is difficult of explanation; does it not find its interpretation in Him? III. It fell about the camp of Israel; so CHRIST came down to feed His people, and is ever giving the living Bread in His Word and Sacraments in His Church, and especially in the Holy Eucharist, by which the benefits of His Incarnation are bestowed on all faithful Israelites. . . . IV. The people must go out to gather it; so all must go forth to gather the food which CHRIST gives. Heb. xiii. 13. V. They must go out in the morning; CHRIST is to be sought early. S. John xii. 35; Gal. vi. 10. VI. They must gather it daily; CHRIST must be our daily bread. VII. All had an equal portion (ver. 18, 22;) there is no respect of persons with CHRIST.² . . . VIII. They cannot gather it on the Sabbath; it is too late to seek for CHRIST in the grave. IX. The miraculous supply ceased to fall on them when they came to Canaan; but they had a golden pot of manna there as a remembrance; CHRIST will be the joy of the saints in heaven, and they will have an everlasting remembrance of the extraordinary mercies vouchsafed to them on earth. X. The worldly-minded disregarded it, and called it ‘light bread;’ so CHRIST in His Word and Sacraments is slighted by the world; but to the faithful Israelite He is angel's food, the living Bread, the Bread of immortality.” (On Ex. xvi. 16—23.)

We have many very good explanations of difficulties which we should like to present to our readers, but we must content ourselves with one or two instances only. The common opinion about the Urim and Thummim is this: that whereas upon the twelve stones which composed the breastplate (and which contained the names of the twelve tribes,) and on the border that surrounded it, were engraved

¹ The LXX. however give λεπτόν.

² Would not this point rather typify how whole CHRIST is received in the Holy Communion?

words comprising the letters of the whole Hebrew Alphabet, the consulting priest was enabled to know the will of God by a certain light which showed itself upon the letters in order, and thus permitted him to spell out the words of the answer. This is the explanation afforded by the Mischna, and repeated by Spencer, Jahn, and other writers on Jewish antiquities. This view is dissented from by Dr. Wordsworth, who comes to a different conclusion as to the nature of the mystery itself, and the mode in which the Divine response was manifested. He notes first (on Ex. xxviii. 30,) that there is no command given by God to *make* the Urim and Thummim, but only to *insert* them into the breastplate. There were in this priestly ornament natural precious stones, engraven with the names of the tribes of Israel, received by Moses from God, and by him placed in their appointed position. After the captivity the High Priesthood, though they had the breastplate, were not able to insert in it the Urim and Thummim. From which it seems clear that the Urim and Thummim were not the gems of the breastplate, otherwise there would have been no reason why the Jews after the return from Babylon should not have procured them as readily as in the wilderness; nor were they any feeling or affection excited in the Priest's mind as he gazed upon them.

"They were like a Divine spirit, given by God to Moses, and put by him into the breastplate, and beaming and flashing forth, as it were, from the gems, and making itself visible to the eye, and perhaps audible to the ear of the high priest, when engaged in ministering before God, and when resorting unto Him for illumination and perfection. . . . It appears that Moses was directed and empowered by God to *put* (or, as the word properly signifies) *to give, and impart, a spiritual* quality to the gems of the breastplate; and the high priest wearing the breastplate before the LORD, was enabled to read God's will by communion with this spiritual gift. We have a remarkable illustration of this infusion of spiritual powers into inanimate objects when used in relation to spiritual purposes in the Christian Church. God vouchsafes to direct and to enable His evangelical priests to impart spiritual virtue to the elements, which are solemnly set apart and consecrated by them for the administration of the Christian Sacraments, according to the institution of CHRIST. The elements are like the jewels of the breastplate; they are inanimate things, but they are made capable of conveying spiritual grace to worthy recipients."

Every one has felt that the design in the erection of the altar of Jehovah-nissi (Ex. xvii. 15, 16) has been very imperfectly brought out in our version: "Moses built an altar, and called the name of it Jehovah-nissi: for he said, Because the LORD hath sworn that the LORD *will have war* with Amalek from generation to generation." The literal rendering is, "For a hand (is) upon the throne of JEHOVAH, war by JEHOVAH with Amalek from generation to generation." Now this contest was no insignificant engagement,

no mere passing hostility between the Israelites and a wandering tribe of Arabia. Moses is solemnly commanded to write the memorial of it in the book; it speaks of the Hand, and of the Throne of JEHOVAH; and it has reference to the enemies of the LORD and His people unto all generations. "Hand" is generally taken here as the symbol of an oath, but Dr. Wordsworth thinks this is at best only a part of the meaning. The victory had been won by the lifting up of Moses' hands, but lest it should be thought that his hands were the cause of victory, he erected an altar, and called it "JEHOVAH my banner," declaring that God was the author of that success. And he adds as a kind of commentary, "Because a *hand* was on the *throne* of the *Lord*, therefore the battle was gained. Not by any inherent virtue in *my hand*, nor by any essential efficacy in the *rod* which was in *my hand*, but because my hand rested on the *throne* of the *Lord*, and because the rod was the rod of God, therefore my prayer prevailed, and so the victory was won." A hand upon the throne of the LORD is the hand to which Moses looks, a hand armed with a rod of power, and that hand is the Hand of Him Who ever lifts it up in heaven in prayer and might, a King and Priest on the throne of God, even CHRIST, Who now rules the world (S. John iii. 35,) and in Whose strength we shall overthrow our enemies.

"Therefore, in Moses seated on the mountain, with the rod of power in his hands, uplifted in prayer, and vanquishing the enemies of GOD, we may see a vision of CHRIST, seated in glory, on the hill of the heavenly Sion, with the rod or sceptre of majesty and dominion in His hand, which is on the throne of JEHOVAH Himself, at Whose right Hand He sits, and will continue to sit from generation to generation, even to the sunset of the world, and until He has subdued all the spiritual Amalekites who defy His power, and persecute His people, and until He has put all enemies under His feet."

The commentary is replete with such like interpretations, which show not only accurate scholarship, but that reverent sagacity of spiritual perception which is so pleasing a feature of this work.

We notice as scarcely satisfactory the comment upon the very full account of the composition of the priestly garments given in the Book of Exodus. Taken in connection with recent events, the manner of treatment is perhaps significant. Certainly fuller typical interpretation would not have been expended uselessly upon such a topic, and the authority thereby afforded for gorgeous ministerial vestments might have seemed worthy of some notice. With Dr. Wordsworth's unfortunate predilections, it was perhaps *expedient* to leave that part of the subject unnoticed. Of similar character is the omission, in commenting on the heave-offerings and wave-offerings, of all mention of the oblation of the elements and the elevation of the Host in the Holy Eucharist, an

omission the more censurable after the publication of Dr. Little-dale's learned and exhaustive treatise. It was perhaps scarcely probable that occasion should have been taken from the mention of incense as used in the service of the sanctuary to note its symbolical employment in the offices of the Christian Church, yet we might have reasonably hoped that the arrangement of the Tabernacle would have led to the consideration of the disposition of the parts and ornaments of our Christian temples. It certainly is noted that a kind of cruciform arrangement obtained in the Tabernacle, the mercy-seat answering to the apse, the table of shewbread and the golden candlestick to the transepts, the golden altar being at the intersection, and the brazen altar occupying the nave; but no attempt is made to demonstrate the symbolism of a Christian Church by the analogy of the Jewish house of prayer, or to show the great principle that underlies both and enables us to explain one by the other.

It could hardly be expected that Dr. Wordsworth could write a book without inserting some attack on the Roman system, which he seems to consider that he has been raised up to withstand. Some of the points thus assaulted may be legitimate subjects of controversy, and the mention of them may occur in natural connection with the matter of the comment, as where he takes exception to the novel dogma of the Immaculate Conception. Others, however, although in themselves they may be fairly open to polemical discussion, are brought in with but little regard to the context, as where in the injunction (Ex. xx. 25) "not to build an altar of hewn stone," is seen a protest against the denial of the cup to the laity, and the worship of saints and angels. Sometimes too, the commentator contends with a bugbear of his own creation, which has no real existence. Thus on the passage which narrates the chiding at Rephidim and Moses' infringement of the command in striking the rock instead of speaking to it, Dr. Wordsworth writes, "The lesson thus taught is, that CHRIST, once smitten, is not to be smitten any more. The Rock is now to be *spoken to*. The Christian minister does not *sacrifice* CHRIST afresh,—as Rome says,—but he speaks to the Rock." We fear our author must have forgotten "Tract XC.," and have never seen Sancta Clara's Treatise on the Articles, or he would not require to be told that the doctrine spoken of in Article XXXI. ("*Missarum sacrificia, quibus vulgo dicebatur sacerdotem offerre Christum in remissionem peccatæ aut culpæ, pro vivis et defunctis*") is not the received doctrine of the Church of Rome, but certain loose opinions held by some individuals at the time when the Articles were framed. The tenets of the Anglican and Roman Churches on the Sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist are virtually identical.

But these omissions and defects are of minor importance when we consider the immense field over which the commentator on the

Pentateuch has to travel, and note how worthily and excellently he has for the most part done his work. Far be it from us to note any little blemishes in so meritorious a performance with a carping ungrateful spirit. They may subtract somewhat from the utility of the commentary, but they do not diminish our appreciation of the learning, industry, and reverence of the author, and our gratitude to him for the work he has so favourably commenced, and which we trust he may be permitted to bring to a conclusion. We shall look forward with the utmost interest to the successive issues of this elaborate commentary.

DR. LIVINGSTONE'S ZAMBESI EXPEDITION.

The Zambesi and its Tributaries. By DAVID and CHARLES LIVINGSTONE. London: John Murray.

DR. Livingstone, in the introduction to the book before us, speaks of himself as a "commonplace traveller." As such, however, he cannot be regarded; for, during his sojourn in England in 1857 and 1858, he, as a traveller, obtained so eminent a position in the estimation of men, that he is for ever removed from the region of commonplace. His name became a "household word." He was not only regarded as most courageous, and most enduring, but as a man of large benevolence, of firm faith, and of a grand catholicity of spirit. Men of all ranks and creeds delighted to do him honour. Our great universities adopted him, the Nonconformists claimed him as their most distinguished hero, and the Queen personally wished him God speed, when, as head of the Zambesi expedition, he again left England for Africa. So that it is not as a "commonplace traveller," but as a "representative man" of his class, that Dr. Livingstone must be regarded and judged; for that was the position given and accepted.

The main object of the Zambesi expedition, as Dr. Livingstone tells us, "was to extend the knowledge already attained of the geography and mineral resources of Eastern and Central Africa; to improve our acquaintance with the inhabitants, and to endeavour to engage them to apply themselves to industrial pursuits and to the cultivation of their lands, with a view to the production of raw material to be exported to England in return for British manufactures; and it was hoped that, by encouraging the natives to occupy themselves in the development of the resources of the country, a considerable advance might be made towards the extinction of the slave trade, as they would not be long in discovering that the

former would eventually be a more certain source of profit than the latter." A noble object truly, and one that reflects honour upon the man who suggested it, and upon the Government—for the expedition was organised under the immediate care of the head of the Foreign Office, Earl Clarendon—who adopted and sustained it. All the aid that science and skill could give to make the expedition a success was given. A staff of officers—men, we presume, not lightly chosen, but selected for their known attainments and special qualifications for the posts they filled—was attached to the expedition; and the book before us is a record of what was done towards carrying out the objects contemplated by the expedition. But the results, we feel bound to say, after a careful perusal of the six hundred and eight pages which constitute the book, appear to us very unsatisfactory.

No expense was spared. We have heard that the expedition, from first to last, cost the Government £80,000. Three steam vessels for river navigation were at different periods placed at Livingstone's disposal; the men-of-war on the coast were continually giving him assistance; his consular appointment assured him a consideration in the eyes of the Portuguese, that, rightly used, might have been of greatest service; yet, despite all these advantages, we cannot help thinking that what was done could have been done by Livingstone, or by any other competent traveller, with a twentieth part of the expense, and in less than half the time occupied by the expedition.

To bear out what we say, we will briefly follow the course of the expedition from the time that the *Ma Robert* was launched, and in company with the *Pearl* commenced the ascent of the Zambesi. The voyage of the *Pearl* soon came to an end; the low state of the water at Mazaro compelled her return. The journey to Tete was not easy. The *Ma Robert* was not capable of carrying much luggage, and light as her draught was, she was continually aground; for the river above Senna, though wide, was very shallow, and full of sand-islands. Of the *Ma Robert* Livingstone repeatedly speaks with much bitterness; for though, in a letter to her builder, (see second edition of Livingstone's Cambridge Lectures, edited by Monk,) he describes her as doing such "admirable service,"—that it would be an immense boon, if Government would send out other vessels like her to run up creeks and rivers, and chase slavers, instead of taking it out of the poor sailors' muscles at the oar,—yet in the book before us she is described as built of "thoroughly unsuitable" material, with "badly-constructed furnaces" and worse engine; and her speed was so inconsiderable, that the heavy laden country canoes kept up with her, while the smaller shot ahead, and the paddlers looked back in wonder and pity at the slow, puffing "asthmatic." "Boats or canoes would have done for the expedition all that *it* did, with half the toil and expense." We do not

wonder, therefore, when Livingstone visited the Kebrabasa Rapids, he discovered them to be an insurmountable barrier to the further progress of the Ma Robert; but we do wonder when, after three visits to Kebrabasa, we find him making an application to Her Majesty's Government for another vessel, in order that he might navigate these Rapids, when, from the description given, we should be inclined to think that a block of wood would be splintered into matches before it traversed their entire length.

This Kebrabasa obstruction was undoubtedly a severe disappointment to Livingstone, who had frequently expressed his conviction that the Zambesi was navigable between Tete and the Victoria Falls.

Unable to carry out the original intention of the expedition, to occupy as a centre of observation the high land of the Zambesi, Dr. Livingstone explored the River Shire, a tributary of the Zambesi, and discovered the Lakes Shirwa and Nyassa; and the descriptions given of these highland lake regions and their inhabitants constitute the most pleasing portion of the narrative. Great hopes were raised by these discoveries. The Shire was spoken of as a splendid stream for steam navigation; the Shire valley and highlands were described as of boundless fertility. Another ship to navigate the Lake Nyassa was sent for, and the results of the expedition promised to surpass the most sanguine expectations. Filled with these ideas the Universities' Mission left England, its destination being the Lake Regions via the Zambesi and Shire. The Pioneer (the new ship sent out by the Government) arrived off the Zambesi at the same time as the missionaries; but after Dr. Livingstone had returned from taking to Linyanti the Makololo left at Tete in 1856, his ideas respecting the country and rivers, of which so many favourable things had been said, seem to have undergone a considerable change; for, instead of taking Bishop Mackenzie and party at once to the district to which he had invited them, he tells them that he is under orders to explore the Rovuma, a river five hundred miles north of the Zambesi, which magnificent highway into the interior he now is anxious to give up, "because the Portuguese had refused to open it to the ships of all nations." We cannot help thinking, from the subsequent experience of the expedition, notwithstanding Dr. Livingstone says, "The expedition was, up to this point, eminently successful; that he had opened a cotton field which, taking in the Shire and Lake Nyassa, was four hundred miles in length, and had gained the confidence of the people wherever he had gone,"—that he had reason at this time to modify the opinion which he had so unreservedly expressed in his letters home as to the capacity of these rivers Zambesi and Shire. Be that as it may, his attention was now directed to the Rovuma. Bishop Mackenzie was dependent upon him for an introduction to the country, and was evidently compelled to consent to Dr. Living-

stone's proposal to go with him to that river. The rest of the missionaries proceeded to Johanna, and awaited the result of this fresh exploration, which was undertaken, we are told, "in order to ascertain whether the country round the head waters of the Rovuma, which were reported to flow out of Nyassa, was a suitable place for a settlement."

The expedition to the Rovuma was a failure. The Pioneer then ran over to Johanna, and having taken on board the missionaries, under the captaincy of Dr. Livingstone recrossed the Mozambique Channel, entered the Zambesi, and ascended the Shire—a work of immense difficulty evidently, as the Pioneer seems to have been continually aground in the rivers; and it took more than two months to accomplish what Dr. Livingstone computes as two hundred miles.

Then came the march up to the Highlands with the missionaries, the meeting with the slavers, and the release of slaves, the encounter with the Ajawa—who are described as the slaving tribe of these parts, and in the employ of the Portuguese—the settlement of the missionaries at Magomera, the immediate return to the ship, and another journey to Lake Nyassa.

Dr. Livingstone enters somewhat minutely into an account of what took place during the few days of his connection with the missionaries on the hills, because, from the subsequent proceedings of the missionaries against the slaving Ajawa, and certain statements at home, he imagines that "blame was thrown upon his shoulders, as if the missionaries had no individual responsibility" for their conduct after he left them. We do not intend to enter upon the discussion of this question, for we have already, in our review of the life of Bishop Mackenzie, expressed our feeling on the conduct of the missionaries at this most painful period; but in justice to them we must say that, though we have read all their published communications on this subject, we have not seen any attempt on their part to evade the responsibility of their own acts. A letter from one of them, it is true, did obtain a wide publication, but a letter, evidently from the writer, is published at page 475, which explains its true object—to make known to friends at the Cape that the missionaries had only done what Dr. Livingstone himself had done, and that he had set them the example; a fact which had not then been made public from anything Dr. Livingstone had said. Our own opinion is, that had not Dr. Livingstone inaugurated an aggressive policy against the slavers and the Ajawa, the missionaries would not have done so. To that extent, therefore, he is responsible for what they did; nor do we think he can escape that responsibility by saying, as he appears practically to have said to Bishop Mackenzie, "Don't do as I have done," when he leaves him in a position where identical action apparently becomes necessary. It is a great pity, and it seems to us most extraordinary, considering all the circumstances, that Dr. Livingstone did

not at once fully appreciate the conduct of Bishop Mackenzie on these occasions ; for we should have expected that he, of all men, would have done so, and unhesitatingly have supported him. Had he done this, it would have saved much misunderstanding on both sides, and to the friends of the mission much painful feeling.

The journey to Lake Nyassa seems to have entailed much difficulty, hardship, and danger ; and we fail to see that it is so desirable a region as Dr. Livingstone would make it appear.

From this point a considerable portion of the book is occupied with the proceedings and fortunes of the Universities' Mission, upon which, we should think, the missionaries themselves were better authorities than Dr. Livingstone. What was afterwards accomplished by the expedition can be soon told.

It took the Pioneer longer to get down the river than to come up. Dr. Livingstone had arranged to meet Bishop Mackenzie at the mouth of the Ruo on his return from the coast on the first of January, and he does not appear to have passed that river on his way down until after that date. It may have been ignorance of this fact which kept Bishop Mackenzie at this place, expecting every hour to see the Pioneer come up the river ; and so he died. The Pioneer did not enter the Shire at all that year ; for when she was laden with the sections of the new ship, the Lady Nyassa, which Livingstone found awaiting him at the coast, she could not make any head against the current. The Nyassa, therefore, was put together at Shupanga, and while this was being done another ineffectual attempt was made upon the Rovuma. Then the Pioneer returned to the Zambesi, and eventually, after much toil and delay, during which it seems the expedition suffered severely from sickness, want of stores, and the effects of disappointment, towed the Lady Nyassa up to the Murchison Cataracts, where it was intended to take her to pieces, and carry her over land on to the Upper Shire. But in this, as in other things, Dr. Livingstone does not seem to have made himself sufficiently acquainted with the difficulties in his way. It was found impossible to carry this ship over land past the Cataracts. The expedition was worn out ; its fortunes were at its lowest ebb. One member of it, Mr. Richard Thornton, had just died ; the other officers had left, or were leaving, when Dr. Livingstone received his recall from Government. And thus ends the history of the expedition. We have well considered all that was done by it, and we are forced to repeat, taking Dr. Livingstone's own narrative as our authority, that it was not the success he evidently thinks it. With the exception of the journeys to the Lakes, which occupied but a very short time comparatively, and the journey to Linyanti in order to take home the Makololo, the expedition appears to have been employed in profitless and wearisome journeys up and down the Zambesi and Shire, and in two ineffectual attempts to get up the Rovuma. No great geographical feat was accomplished, our know-

ledge of the mineral resources of Eastern and Central Africa is not much enlarged, and the field of commerce in this part of the world has yet to be opened to us.

In saying this, however, we must at the same time express our conviction that the expedition, in directing public attention to the horrible effects of the slave trade in East Central Africa, has accomplished a work which, we trust, with God's blessing, will lead to great results; though we could have wished that Dr. Livingstone, in speaking of the Portuguese, to some of whom he appears to have been much indebted, had shown less animosity. Indeed, the pleasure of reading this book, which is in many respects a most interesting account of African travel, abounding with minute observations of nature, and graphic illustrations of native character, is quite destroyed by the ungenerous reflections upon individuals which mar almost every chapter from the beginning to the end. And nothing can be more painful than the want of sympathy manifested for the missionaries in their trials and bereavements; while the insinuations respecting them and others are quite unworthy of any man, and are most reprehensible in a man holding so eminent a position as Dr. Livingstone. If he praises Bishop Mackenzie, it is to condemn, openly or by inference, some one else, in his estimation less worthy of praise; while his attack upon Bishop Tozer is most uncharitable. It may be that Bishop Tozer did not act with that consideration for the surviving members of Bishop Mackenzie's staff that he might have done; he may have erred also in not taking their advice to give the Shire Highlands another trial,—in not making a more resolute attempt to hold that part of Africa for which so much sacrifice of valuable life had been made, and where so much influence had been gained; but if he in these matters erred, it was an error quite pardonable under the circumstances of the country and mission, and it is much to be regretted that Dr. Livingstone, evidently prompted by personal feeling, should have spoken of him as he has done. Provocation to some extent, but unintentional provocation we believe in most instances, Dr. Livingstone may have had; but should he, by God's mercy, ever obtain more of that charity which "is not easily provoked," that which he has said of Bishop Tozer and others will be amongst the keenest regrets of his life. Inexperienced the members of the mission may have been, mistakes they may have made, but they were brave-hearted, gentle-minded, Christian men, and their efforts deserve a more charitable recognition than Dr. Livingstone has given them. A great traveller, a brave man, a much-enduring man, a generous, faithful champion of the African, Dr. Livingstone undoubtedly is; but we cannot read this second book of his without feeling disappointed that our highest estimate of him has not met with an ampler verification.

The experiences of the Zambesi expedition, and the fate which has attended Baron von der Decken's recent ambitious attempt, lead

us to conclude that expeditions on a large scale are a mistake in Africa. Dr. Livingstone as a traveller, with one or two congenial coadjutors, would, we feel assured, have accomplished more for science, and quite as much for humanity, as Dr. Livingstone the chief of a great and an expensive expedition. His last journey to Lake Nyassa, after the officers of the expedition had left him, and while he was waiting for the flood season to enable him to take the ships down to the coast, confirms our opinion of him as an incomparable traveller. We know nothing in its way more interesting than his account of this journey; and while reading it we could not help regretting that he had for so long a time been tied to a position involving not only the management of ships, but the command of officers, the control of crews, and constant provision of stores—a position for which we cannot help seeing he is, by character and previous habits of life, quite unfitted.

In some respects the present is a more readable book than the “Missionary Travels,” but we think that the continual use by Dr. Livingstone of the third person in speaking of himself is a great mistake: it may be humility, but it looks like affectation.

As might be expected from the publisher, the getting up of the book and the execution of the illustrations are excellent.

NEWMAN'S REPLY TO PUSEY'S EIRENICON.

A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon.

By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. London: Longman and Co., Paternoster Row. 1866.

THIS reply to an Eirenicon is an Eirenicon itself; so justly written; so much conceded; so persuasive; so hortatory, that it seems as if we were one with Dr. Newman still; as if he were amongst us as in the days of old; as if he were speaking to us as ever, as being loving children of his, and he were correcting us with a fatherly yet gentle hand. So much is conceded; and there are grouped together nearly all the extremest points of doctrine; nearly all the extravagant sayings which have found a place in the Roman Church during the last few centuries; and these are all denied; denied in the strongest and most positive way; denied in such terms as the following:

“Sentiments such as these I never knew of till I read your book, nor, as I think, do the vast majority of English Catholics know them. They seem to me like a bad dream. I could not have conceived them to be said . . . they do but scare and confuse me. I should not be

holier, more spiritual, more sure of perseverance, if I twisted my moral being into the reception of them I will say plainly that I had rather believe (which is impossible) that there is no God at all than that Mary is greater than God. I will have nothing to do with sentiments, which can only be explained, by being explained away I consider them calculated to prejudice inquirers, to frighten the unlearned, to unsettle consciences, to provoke blasphemy, and to work the loss of souls."—Pp. 119—121.

Such is Dr. Newman's answer in regard to what may be considered to be the later teaching of the Western Church upon the doctrine of the Blessed Virgin. The whole of the letter is devoted to the consideration of this most important question, which becomes so important because connected with a recent decree that has done so much to widen the breach unhappily existing between ourselves and Western Christendom. The Letter is a defence of the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception of the Blessed Virgin; and it contains such glowing and eloquent descriptions of her various titles, of her exaltation, of her intercessory power, *of her parallel as the second Eve*, that while we read these pages we feel as if it was impossible to help being quite carried away by the logic and eloquence of the writer. It seems, moreover, to be so ungrateful, so much having been given up to us, to turn round and take away so large a portion from the remainder, which is presented for our acceptance; and yet this is what we are bound to do. We shall endeavour to answer Dr. Newman on his own ground and to decide a question which he asks Dr. Pusey to answer—"Have you not, my dear friend, been unjust to yourself in your recent volume, and made far too much of the differences which exist between Anglicans and us on this particular point?" We venture to say, that we shall be able to prove that Dr. Pusey has not been unjust to himself in his "Eirenicon;" that he has not made far too much of the differences which exist between ourselves and our Western brethren on the doctrine of the Virgin Mary. And it is because, as Dr. Newman himself allows, it is so difficult, nay, almost impossible, on this subject, "to draw the line clearly between truth and error, right and wrong," that we must carefully watch the beginning of the teaching; and also guard ourselves against being overcome by it unawares. Dr. Newman complains that in the hundred pages which Dr. Pusey devotes to the Blessed Virgin he gives a one-sided view of the Western teaching concerning her. "It may be a salutary castigation, if any of us have fairly provoked it, but it is not making the best of matters: it is not smoothing the way for an understanding or a compromise." (P. 9.) And again, "Have you even hinted that our love for her is anything else than an abuse? Have you thrown her one kind word yourself all through your book? I trust so, but I have not lighted upon one." (P. 121.) Once more, "you complain of

our being 'dry, hard, and unsympathizing;' and we answer that you are unfair and irritating. But we at least have not professed to be composing an *Irenicon*, when we treated you as foes." (P. 9.) This is the aspect in which Dr. Newman regards Dr. Pusey's treatment of the subject under discussion. With the other personal matters which here, as in all Dr. Newman's writings, occupy so considerable a space, we cannot now meddle; suffice to say, that objection is taken to the two English writers which are quoted in support of extreme Marian teaching, and we are thrown back upon the time-honoured names of the late Cardinal, Dr. Lingard, Dr. Rock, and others; it being asked, "which of these ecclesiastics has said anything extreme about the prerogative of the Blessed Virgin or the infallibility of the Pope?" (P. 25.)

The first distinction which Dr. Newman makes is between the doctrine of and the devotion to the Blessed Virgin; the former remaining constant, the latter ever increasing and changing. Another distinction is made between faith and devotion; and it is further asserted that we may believe without feeling devotion. This is quite true, but its converse is not true. We have faith in that to which we pay devotion. All such comparisons as devotion to Shakespeare, the Chinese faith in the magnet, and the like, are out of place, when applied to sacred subjects. If it be true, that devotion to the Virgin differs at various times, and in various places, we say that the faith in her; in her intercession, in her holiness, in her greatness, varies in the same ratio. The Italian Manual of Prayers, the *Raccolta*, may contain a number and a variety of devotions, and yet they may be all equally expressive, all equally strong, and may equally express the same faith. A curious hypothesis is made use of, to explain certain novel devotions, such as those which are now made to S. Joseph. A galaxy of saints were nearer to our LORD than either the Apostles or Martyrs, so near to Him in fact that they were lost in His glory. They fell out of the Church's sight for a long time, and when the meditative life was more developed, "then those luminous stars rose in the ecclesiastical heavens, which were of more august dignity than any which had preceded them, and were late in rising, for the very reason they were so specially glorious." (P. 33.) These remarks are applied to S. Joseph, who it is stated "was an object of the universal and absolute faith of the Christian world from the first, yet the devotion to him is of comparatively late date." Now this theory is neither supported by Holy Scripture nor by the teaching of the great Fathers. The Apostles of our LORD have their lives recorded for our instruction, and we read in Scripture of the saints of GOD under both dispensations. As to these invisible saints, they are a pure and arbitrary fiction, an invention of the brain of some wild visionary. If there was an invisible saint nearer to our blessed LORD and more beloved by Him than S.

John, surely Holy Scripture, (reasoning after the analogy of faith,) would have told us somewhat of him. The Virgin Mother was very dear to the Divine SON, and so we read of the last provision made for her during her earthly life; the beloved Mother went to dwell with the beloved disciple.

We challenge Dr. Newman to produce one proof that S. Joseph was an object of real thought to the Christian Church for the first four hundred years and long afterwards. The Church universal has never had any "absolute faith" in him at all; he dropped from her notice as he passed out of his existence. Believing in the perpetual virginity of the blessed Virgin, we say S. Joseph was only connected with her by the legal ties of the Jewish law. With our blessed LORD he had really nothing whatever to do. It is too bad of Dr. Newman to make such a bold and positive statement, and not to support it by an appeal to a single passage in Holy Scripture, or by the explicit statement of a leading Father of the Church. Christian art shows us for how many centuries S. Joseph did not appear as a separate personage; it is as late as the thirteenth century that we first find him represented alone, or as the central figure of a group. Popular art is a very fair test of popular devotion, and in this case too both are witnesses to the late introduction of this new object of faith in the Western Church.

By far the most critical portion of Dr. Newman's Letter is that which by quotations from the Fathers sets forth the Virgin as the "second Eve." We shall see directly how very much this expression must be modified when other passages from their writings are brought to bear upon the question. After all, it would appear that Eve was but a type of Mary; the strict parallelism which is contended for, falls to the ground upon a rigorous examination. Firstly, it is stated that both Eve before the fall and Mary all through her life, were in a state of supernatural grace; and the argument is, that if Eve had grace, how much more grace must Mary have had. The schoolmen certainly did attribute both to Adam and Eve a very large amount of original righteousness; yet it must be remembered, that they had not grace enough to preserve their free will from choosing disobedience rather than obedience. For the parallel to hold good Eve ought never to have fallen, and Mary ought to have been kept from venial sin, which Holy Scripture and the Fathers tell us that she committed. With the testimony of S. Irenæus before us, it is hard to understand the following sentence: "It is true, as several great Fathers of the *fourth* century do imply or assert, that on one or two occasions she did sin venially or showed infirmity." It is near akin to blasphemy to liken for a moment the overshadowing of the Virgin by God the HOLY GHOST to the evil influence of the wicked one seducing Eve. Nor does the parallel hold good in another particular: Eve by her own direct act and thought conceived and brought forth sin; she

had a strong personal consciousness of what she was doing. It was not so in the case of Mary; the HOLY GHOST came upon her, and the power of the Highest overshadowed her; all unknowing and unconscious of the work that GOD was doing by her, and of the chosen vessel which He had called her to be. Again: Eve brought forth sin, the very sin itself, which she herself communicated by her influence and power over Adam. The blessed Virgin did not bring forth life in this sense; our LORD did not become the true Life of the world until He had redeemed the world by His own death, and justified it, by His own resurrection. He was the Life of the world, as being the SAVIOUR of the world, which He was not in very deed until He died. We must say, that whatever grace Eve may have had, she fell after the order of nature; that Holy Thing which was born of the Virgin, was after the order of grace.

One circumstance in the parallel Dr. Newman has strangely overlooked. Eve was *second* to Adam, she was formed after him, a portion of him, and for him. It was Adam and not Eve that must be looked at, as the head and representative of the Fall. So with the Virgin Mary; the source of life was not in her, but in Him Who was born of her, being conceived by the HOLY GHOST. The parallel, to be rightly applied, must be carried a step further back, or a grade higher; in other words, we must pass even from the sub-Apostolic Fathers to the Apostle Paul himself. He does not draw any contrast or parallel between Eve and Mary; but he does draw a most striking antithesis between Adam and CHRIST. "For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive." (1 Cor. xv. 22.) Upon these words S. Thomas Aquinas says that the Apostle proves CHRIST to be the first fruits of those who are sleeping in a general and in a special manner. "God wished to reintegrate human nature; but human nature was corrupted through man, because death entered through man; it pertained therefore to the dignity of human nature that it should be reintegrated through man; that is, that it should be brought back to life. It was therefore fitting that as death had entered through man, through Adam,—so the resurrection of the dead should be made through Man, through CHRIST. 'For if by one man's offence (*ἀνθρώπου*, not *γυνή*) death reigned, by one,' &c. (Rom. v. 17.) The Apostle proves this specially by the 'as in Adam we all die,' and 'so we are all made alive in CHRIST;' 'by one man's disobedience, &c., by the obedience of one' (Rom. v. 19.) And he does not say by Eve, but by Adam, as being the cause. For if *Eve alone* had sinned, original sin would not have been handed down among the posterities." This mention of Eve by S. Thomas Aquinas goes far to lower that parallel which Dr. Newman claims for Mary for her own sake; and S. Paul even speaks of the primary disobedience having come through the man, the woman merely being "in the

transgression." The contrast between the first man Adam, who was made a living soul, and the last Adam, our blessed LORD, a quickening spirit; points exactly the same way. We gladly follow again the guiding of S. Thomas Aquinas on this text. "There are two beginnings of the human race. One, according to the life of nature, which is Adam, the other according to the life of grace. The living soul (*animalitas*) in all men is derived from the first beginning, from Adam: it therefore remains that much more fully, from the second beginning, from CHRIST, the quickening spirit is derived in all men." So that little is gained, were the parallel fully allowed, between Eve and Mary, for the teaching of the Fathers agrees consistently in maintaining that CHRIST is the Second Adam, the new spiritual head of our race; whilst Eve is not spoken of, as the mother of death, but it is Adam's transgression by which death came into the world. Allowing for the sake of argument that SS. Justin and Irenæus, and Tertullian, do regard Eve as the type of Mary; this *typical* resemblance does not alter the main conditions of the argument; neither is it one upon which to found an important point of doctrine. Dr. Newman has taken three passages, in which these three Fathers have expressed this type; and then he has proceeded to draw from them certain deductions. Now if these passages stood alone, without any other portions of their writings explaining them in any way, then Dr. Newman would be quite justified in drawing his deductions from them; their truth or their falsehood being determined by reasoning which embraces all the topics of the case. But they do not stand alone; there are numbers of incidental teachings and expressions which enable us to define their meaning and limit their application. For example, we might legitimately from the parallel with Eve deduce the holiness of the Virgin, and then work it up into the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception. But we cannot do this, for S. Justin and Tertullian say distinctly that CHRIST was the *only one* of our race who was perfectly free from sin, from actual sin that is; for Tertullian, when a Montanist attributed to our blessed LORD a human nature in which sin dwelt, as we shall show directly, in illustration of the quotation which is brought forward by Dr. Newman. S. Irenæus says more than this, for when our LORD, at the miracle of Cana in Galilee said to His Mother, "Woman, what have I to do with thee," &c., He was repelling her unseasonable haste (*ejus intempestivam festinationem*), and this opinion is supported by S. Chrysostom, Theophylact, Euthymius. (*Adv. Hær. iii. 7.*) This is allowed to be a venial sin, and any expression that S. Irenæus may make in regard to the office of the Virgin in the salvation of man must be interpreted with reference to this statement. This is especially important in the case of S. Irenæus, because he is very emphatic on the typical nature of Eve. "But Eve was disobedient; for she obeyed not, while she was yet a

virgin becoming disobedient, became the cause of death both to herself and to the whole human race; so also Mary, having the predestined Man being yet a virgin, being obedient, became both to herself and the whole human race the cause of salvation and so the knot of Eve's disobedience received its unloosing through the obedience of Mary; for what Eve, a virgin, bound by incredulity, that Mary, a virgin, unloosed by faith." (Adv. Hær. iii. 22, 34.) This is but a portion of the quotation as given by Dr. Newman, and a part of another one runs thus: "And, though the one had disobeyed God, yet the other was drawn to obey God; that of the virgin Eve the virgin Mary might become the advocate. And, as by a virgin the human race have been bound to death, by a virgin it is saved, the balance being preserved, a virgin's disobedience by a virgin's obedience." (Ib. v. 19.)

S. Irenæus did not regard Eve as the channel of death to man, any more than he regarded Mary to be the channel of life. We read: "For as by the disobedience of one *man* who first was formed out of the earth of poor material, many were made sinners and forfeited life, so it behoved that through the obedience of one *Man*, Who first was born of a virgin, many should be justified and receive salvation." (Ib. iii. 19.) "For as by the disobedience of one man sin had an entrance, and by sin death came; so by the obedience of one man righteousness came to make fruitful those men who formerly were dead." (Ib. 30.) "God, against Whom through the first Adam we offend, not keeping His commandment; but in the Second Adam we are reconciled, being made obedient unto death." (Ib. 16.) Speaking of the fall through Satan it is observed, "for since in the beginning he persuaded man to transgress the precept of the Maker . . . therefore he had him in his own power; but his power is transgression and apostasy, and by these he bound man; so again it was fitting that *through man* he should be overcome and bound with the same chains with which he bound man." (Ib. v. 21.) If Adam is set forth as the head of the fall, CHRIST is set forth as the deliverer from the fall as the Second Adam. Many times the parallel is alluded to by S. Irenæus, it forms a primary element in his teaching; the other type is but seldom referred to, and then most frequently in a secondary sense. We shall better understand the drift of S. Irenæus's teaching when we have compared it with that of S. Justin and Tertullian.

We will now take the quotation from S. Justin, which although rightly placed first in the Letter, we prefer to consider in the second place, since the more general statements of S. Irenæus pave the way towards a little more exact criticism than could be given to it as literally translated by Dr. Newman, and endeavour to find out what is its true and grammatical meaning; and then

we will compare it with some other statements made by the same early Father.

"We know that He, before all creatures, proceeded from the FATHER by His power and will, . . . and by means of the Virgin became Man, that by what way the disobedience arising from the serpent had its beginning, by that way also it might have an undoing. For Eve, being a virgin undefiled, conceiving the word that was from the serpent, brought forth disobedience and death: but the Virgin Mary, taking faith and joy when the Angel told her the good tidings, that the Spirit of the LORD should come upon her and the power of the Highest overshadow her, and therefore the Holy One that was born of her was SON OF GOD, answered, Be it to me according to thy word."—P. 36.

Firstly; we notice, that throughout this passage the preposition *διὰ* is used with the genitive case; as implying the *instrument*, the means by which an event is brought about, and not with an accusative case so as to express causation. It is of the utmost importance for us to remark upon this use of the *instrumental genitive* with the preposition, in place of the causal accusative, because it is one of the charges that Dr. Newman brings against Dr. Pusey, that he regards the Blessed Virgin as a "physical instrument in our redemption;" and that he maintains that "the Fathers speak of the Blessed Virgin as the instrument of our salvation, in that she gave birth to the Redeemer." Dr. Newman contradicts this positively; "the three Fathers," S. Justin, Tertullian, and S. Irenæus, "unanimously declare that she was not a mere instrument in the Incarnation, such as David or Judah may be considered; they declare that she co-operated in our salvation, not merely by the descent of the HOLY GHOST upon her body, but by specific holy acts, in effect of the HOLY GHOST upon her soul." (P. 38.) If this be true in the case of S. Justin, why does he not use the accusative instead of the genitive case? Why, instead of writing *διὰ τῆς παρθένου* *δι' ἧς ὁδοῦ* *διὰ ταύτης τῆς ὁδοῦ*, did he not write *διὰ τὴν παρθένον*—*δι' ἣν ὁδὸν*—*διὰ ταύτην τὴν ὁδὸν*? Simply because he was careful to teach just that very notion that Dr. Newman denies that he held. Two idiomatic forms were open for S. Justin to use: one that should clearly imply instrumentality; the other, which should equally imply causation; or as Dr. Newman has it, "co-operation." Under these circumstances the use of the *instrumental* instead of the *causative* case becomes a fact of great significance, for it renders the only mention which S. Justin makes of the Blessed Virgin, except casually, as being the Mother of our LORD, (Dial. 23,) a standing witness against a theory which has no foundation either from Holy Scripture or from the writings of the earlier Fathers.

Secondly; there is another grammatical construction which no less decidedly contradicts Dr. Newman's statement; it is the em-

ployment of the genitive absolute in the phrase "εὐαγγελιζομένου Γαβριὴλ ἀγγέλου;" "when the angel Gabriel told her the good tidings." Giving the example, ἐμοῦ καθεύδοντος, "while, whereas, or *because* I was sleeping at the time;" Dr. Donaldson adds, "It is a mistake to confuse this with the genitive as expressing the relation of time." (Gk. Gram. p. 488, second edit.) It is a *causal* genitive, it expresses "the starting point *from* which we set out, the *cause* of some action;" "the *source from* which something else proceeds." (Id. p. 465.) The same Father who uses an *instrumental* construction when speaking of the Virgin, uses the *causative* one, when speaking of the Angelical message; and this construction is supported by a significant clause of the same sentence in which S. Justin has followed the inspired S. Luke, διὸ καὶ τὸ γεννώμενον, for it would be contrary to every principle of construing to refer the causative διὸ = δι' ὃ = on which account, to "Μαρία ἡ παρθένος" instead of to the "πνεῦμα Κυρίου."

Thirdly; we object to the most active sense of "taking" being used here instead of the less active meaning which λαμβάνω bears of "receiving." The Oxford translator of S. Justin, Mr. Davie, endorses this view by rendering the words, "But Mary the Virgin *receiving* faith and joy." Otto gives "percepisset" in his version, which is applied to the receiving of a city or an inheritance from any one; and Styan Thirlby, a very great scholar, reads, "Fide autem et lætitia concepta;" faith and joy being conceived; a faith and joy unknown, unreceived, unconceived of before that time. According to S. Justin then, the Annunciation opened a new life to the humble Jewish maiden; by it she received good tidings, which filled her with a faith and joy, to which before she had been a stranger; it told her in words, what in very truth was invisibly and unknowingly going on within her. That she did not half understand the message we have ample proof from Holy Scripture in regard to the way in which in after years she treated and regarded her Divine Son. It was πίστις that she received with her χάρις, not γνῶσις. Her reward will be the reward of faith, and not a recompense which springs from spiritual knowledge and discernment and "co-operation" by specific holy acts. Certainly S. Justin makes no mention of "specific holy acts;" Dr. Newman would scarcely call the receiving of faith "a holy act," and of the other and higher gift of the overshadowing of the HOLY GHOST, she was but a willing though unconscious recipient. The case is not improved if we grant her parallel with Eve, for the instrumental genitive applies to the way of Eve, as well as to the way of Mary; in both instances the instruments, and not the causes of the fall and the recovery are women. We really obtain but little from this passage of S. Justin except that Eve was a type in the way of contrast of Mary, and that she was divinely appointed by supernatural means, to become the Mother of our Blessed Lord.

Before leaving the testimony of S. Justin, in regard to the Blessed Virgin, there are two other points to be noticed. It is assumed by Dr. Newman and others, that from the moment of Mary's birth her debt of original sin "was remitted by anticipation," "in her the sentence was not carried out." Speaking of the supernatural primitive grace of Adam and Eve, Dr. Newman continues: "Mary could not merit any more than they, the restoration of that grace; but it was restored to her by God's free bounty, from the very first moment of her existence, and therefore in fact she *never came under the original curse*, which consisted in the loss of it." (P. 51.) In this same dialogue S. Justin writes of "JESUS CHRIST the SON of GOD being born, according to the will of GOD, *without sin* (δίχα ἁμαρτίας) of a Virgin, who was of the race of Abraham," (c. 23;) and he assigns in his treatise on the "Resurrection," of which a fragment is preserved amongst his genuine writings, a reason for this. "And our LORD JESUS CHRIST (for no other cause) was born of a Virgin, than that He might destroy the birth of unlawful desire, and might show to the powers (of evil,) that without human intercourse the formation of man was possible to GOD," (c. iii.) We must compare this statement of our Blessed LORD "being born" apart from sin, with other statements, such as these: "According to the law of Moses, the whole race of man (πᾶν γένος ἀνθρώπων) will be found to lie under a curse;" "and no one exactly (οὐδείς ἀκριβῶς) performed all these things." The FATHER willed "that His CHRIST should take the curses of all for the whole race of man." (Dial. c. 95.) No exception is made in favour of the Blessed Virgin. CHRIST is proved by His works and miracles, by His doctrines, and by the prophecies of Him, "to be in every respect (κατὰ πάντα) without blame or fault (ἄμωμον καὶ ἀνέγκλητον)," Id. c. 35. He is without offence, neither did He sin even in word (μηδὲ μέχρι φωνῆς ἡμαρτηκέναι αὐτόν.) Dr. Newman speaks of a particular faculty or grace which kept the Blessed Virgin free from all sin. S. Justin makes no mention of this as applied to her; but he makes frequent mention of a peculiar power, dwelling upon and resting with our Blessed LORD, who needed nothing, who had all power, all gifts and graces in Himself; who received all that He did receive, and suffered all that He was called upon to endure, by His own power and will. Speaking of Isaiah xx. 1—3, "So that it was not because He had need of this power (οὐ διὰ τὸ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἰσθῆ δύναμει,) that it was prophesied that these powers should come upon Him." Again, as soon as He was born He had this power (ἔσχεν τὴν δύναμιν.) Just what Dr. Newman would, on the authority of S. Justin, claim for the Mother, that the saint ascribes to her Son. She is included by him among the rest of sinners. She is not stated to be graced in any special way by the power of the HOLY GHOST *for her own sake*, apart from the Incarnation of her LORD. In S. Justin there is nothing whatever to warrant us

in attributing to her either great sanctity or peculiar greatness, except as "a way," an instrument chosen by God and blessed by God, to fulfil His gracious purposes for man. There is no mention made of Mary, while so much is spoken of Jesus. She drops out of his argument with Trypho the Jew, just in the same way as she drops out of the Gospel¹ history. This want of *association* of the Mother with the Son, makes the contrast between the human and the divine to be most clearly seen. The human Mother in time is not permanently to be united with Him who is "Begotten of the FATHER before the worlds." As at creation matter was consecrated by receiving the impress of the archetypal mind and pattern of GOD; so at the Incarnation the substance of the Virgin, as far as pertained to the LORD, was sanctified by that overshadowing of the HOLY GHOST, and what was before sinful, and subject to sin, became, as appropriated by Him, pure and free from all sin. When her use was finished, and the Son was born, reverence and favour belonged to her still. The time of her fulness of grace had passed away.

Tertullian is the next witness who is called to bear testimony to the Blessed Virgin, as the second Eve. The passage quoted is a very celebrated one, from the "De Carne Christi," c. xvii. : "God recovered His image and likeness, which the devil had seized, by a rival operation. For into Eve, as yet a virgin, had crept the word which was the framer of death. Equally into a Virgin was to be introduced the Word of God, which was the building-up of life: that what by that sex had gone into perdition, by the same sex might be brought back to salvation. Eve had believed the serpent, Mary believed Gabriel; the fault which the one committed by believing, the other by believing has blotted out." (P. 36.) Dr. Newman makes much of this testimony, dwelling especially upon Mary's having blotted out (*delevit*) Eve's fault: upon her having brought back the female sex to salvation (*per eundem sexum redigeretur in salutem*.) He asserts, moreover, that the doctrine of Tertullian was representative, that it was the received doctrine of his time and place: "For writers after all are but witnesses of facts and beliefs, and as such are treated by all parties in controversial discussion." (P. 40.) We grant this fully, unreservedly, so that Tertullian represents the belief of the African Church. But if so, that Church was in error, denying even the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin.

In this same treatise on the flesh of CHRIST we read of S. Mary: "Et virgo quantum à viro, NON VIRGO quantum a pactu, non tamen ut ideo non peperit: et ideo virgo quæ non virgo, quia non de visceribus suis mater." (*De Carne Christi*, c. xxiii.) By paturition

¹ It is remarkable that S. Mary is not *named* anywhere in the Epistles. In the reference made to her by S. Paul ("born of a woman") she seems in a marked way placed on a level with the ordinary daughters of Eve.

the virginity of Mary was lost ; and this is a fact and belief of which Tertullian is a witness. The sinful nature of the flesh of CHRIST, is another heresy which Tertullian supports in this treatise. The condemnation of sin in the flesh (Rom. viii. 3.) is called an emptying of sin : "*Evacuavit peccatum in carne.*" It was needful that the flesh of CHRIST should be sinful, like that flesh which He came to empty of sin, "*quando hinc etiam confirmamus eam fuisse carnem in Christo, cujus natura est in homine peccativo.*" It would have been foreign to His purpose to destroy sin in the flesh, if He had not been in that flesh in which was the nature of sin (*non in eâ carne, in qua erat natura peccati,*) neither to His glory, for what great thing, if in another and better flesh, that is, not of sinful nature, He had removed the spot of sin ? Wherefore, it is said, that if He put on our nature the flesh of CHRIST was sinful : putting on our nature He made it His own, and making it His own He did not make it sinful," (c. xvi.) These two errors in doctrine are sufficiently accounted for. The "*De Carne Christi,*" was written when Tertullian was out of communion with the Church ; therefore it contains anti-Catholic teaching. The books against Marcion were composed under the same circumstances, and in them he speaks of a Virgin having brought forth a CHRIST, according to the general law of a convicted body. What can we think of Dr. Newman quoting a Montanist authority, by which to uphold the teaching of the Catholic Church ? If the Church of Africa believed in the sinful nature of the body of our LORD, and denied the perpetual virginity of the Blessed Virgin, the less said about the creed of the African Church the better. Dr. Newman knows better than this ; he knows that Tertullian was a heretic when he wrote the "*De Carne Christi,*" but a portion of this extraordinary composition suits his purpose, and so he uses it, assuming it to be authoritative and Catholic teaching, and generalising from it about the prevailing faith and belief of the African Church. We should not consider Tertullian to be a trustworthy authority, by whom to support any doctrine that we might desire to establish ; but Dr. Newman *has* brought him forward to be a witness to the Virgin's holiness and headship of the fallen race, and we will examine him a little further on these points. The introduction of sin into the world, and the fall of man, Tertullian attributes to *Adam* and not to *Eve*. Speaking of Satan, he adds, "through whom *man* being from the beginning beguiled (*per quem homo a primordio circumventus*) . . . thenceforth made the whole race infected of *his* seed (*de suo semine.*) (De Test. An. iii.) The Prodigal Son in the parable returning to his father, is like a wicked man who returning to God receives that garment—that pristine state which *Adam* had lost (*Adam amiserat,*) having transgressed against Him." (De Pudicitia, c. ix.) Satan's work at the Fall is described at some length, in the tract De Patientia,

c. v., "the devil could not bear to think that God had committed His creation to His own image, that is to man," (*imagini suæ, id est, homini*), and envied him. "Adeo decepit *eum*, because he had envied him." Adam is spoken of in the De Exhort. Castitatis (c. ii.) as the prince of a race, and of the transgression (*princeps generis et delicti*.) Every soul is spoken of as being valued in *Adam*, until it be re-valued in *CHRIST*. De Anima, c. xli. (in *Adam* censetur—in *Christo* recenseatur.) Sin and death are attributed most unmistakably, by Tertullian, to the sin of Adam and not to the sin of Eve. Mention is directly and positively made of Adam, very casually and typically of Eve. Grant Mary to be the parallel of Eve—"the second Eve"—little is gained by this; for Tertullian throws all headship, dignity, and even the burden of punishment upon Adam, not upon Eve. But though Tertullian takes away the headship of Eve, and, according to Dr. Newman, her anti-type Mary, surely he spares her sanctity. He excepts her from the common lot: he removes her from the effects of the common curse. Dr. Newman knows Tertullian's words far better than we do—"Solus enim Deus sine peccato, et solus homo sine peccato Christus: quia et Deus Christus." (De An. c. xli.) The Roman commentators say nothing to this, but that S. Augustine in more than one place excepts the Blessed Virgin Mary. They do not, because they cannot defend or reason away Tertullian's "*solus homo*." Yet the Fathers, SS. Justin and Irenæus, and Tertullian, according to some controversialists, proclaim both the Immaculate Conception and the Exaltation of the Blessed Virgin.

(To be continued.)

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

(Continued from p. 42.)

IN the vessels of wrath fitted for destruction, there is an allusion to the example of Pharaoh, which the Apostle had just brought forward, and the word "fitted" signifies, as S. Chrysostom says, "fully fitted indeed, but by his own proper self" (*κατηρτισμένον*): thus the vessels of wrath are those who obstinately resist God's grace, and whom He endures with much longsuffering, till they have filled up the measure of their iniquities. The very word "longsuffering," we may remark, refutes the predestinarian view, since if we suppose that God created certain persons (as the potter makes some vessels to dishonour) for eternal destruction, with what appropriateness can it be said that He endured their wickedness "with much *longsuffering*?" Such an expression can have no

meaning, since the wickedness of the vessels of wrath is simply a fulfilment of God's own purpose, and the direct consequence of His decree of reprobation. The wicked are really according to the predestinarian theory, living in obedience to their Maker's will, and walking in that path to which they are eternally predestined.

But it may be said that a mysterious dispensation of God, apparently at least, contrary to man's ideas of right and wrong, is unmistakably set before us in the ninth chapter of the Romans, and that if we reject the predestinarian interpretation, how are the Apostle's words to be understood? Mr. Mozley thus sets forth the Apostle's meaning: "It being" (he says,) "expressly said that the purpose of God according to election is antecedent to any difference of life and conduct between one man and another, that it is formed while the children are yet unborn, and have done neither good nor evil; that it is not of works, but of Him that calleth; that it is not of him that willeth, nor of him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy; that it is clay of the same lump, of which some vessels are made to honour and some to dishonour."

Now the ultra-Augustinian or Calvinistic view of election, it will be said, is here *manifestly* set forth, and in refusing to admit it, we are evading, as Mr. Mozley intimates, the obvious sense of Holy Scripture. This only shows the influence of modern prejudices and opinions, and how frequently they blind our eyes, and lead us to see a meaning in Scripture which most assuredly is not there. S. Chrysostom, we may remark, the most acute commentator of the ancient Church, and who could trace the argumentation of S. Paul, and analyse his meaning with remarkable power and ability, has discovered no trace of predestination in the chapter before us. But what is the Apostle's meaning—a meaning that will render intelligible his language which has been just quoted? The Apostle himself intimates his own meaning when he says, "even us whom He hath called, not only of the Jews, but also of the Gentiles." The election of some to Church privileges, and the non-election of others, will fully satisfy the Apostle's meaning; that is, if we only set aside modern opinions and traditions, and consider what Holy Scripture itself teaches on the unspeakable need of Church privileges and the immeasurable difference between those possessed and others who have been deprived of them. Thus the heathen are represented as being in a state of darkness, as "dead in trespasses and sins," as "lost," as "without hope and without God in the world;" whilst Christians are "light in the LORD," "risen with CHRIST," "saved," and "inheritors of the kingdom of heaven." And why this vast difference between one and another?—why is one left in darkness and the shadow of death, and another raised together with CHRIST, and made to sit in heavenly places in Him? Simply owing to God's inscrutable decree and purpose: hence to one is the Gospel preached: he is called, adopted, regenerated, sanctified, jus-

tified, saved in holy Baptism ; whilst another is left in a state of nature, dead in trespasses and sins. " Shall the thing formed say to him that formed it, Why hast thou made me thus ?—hath not the potter power over the clay to make one vessel to honour and another to dishonour ?"

But though the Catholic doctrine recognizes the inscrutable nature of God's predestination, still it manifestly differs from the theory of S. Augustine or the system of Calvin. The heathen, though under the most fearful disadvantages, are not irreversibly consigned to destruction. S. Paul himself speaks of the law written in their hearts (Rom. ii. 15,) according to which they shall be judged ; and accepted by God if they faithfully follow the light of conscience and improve their opportunities, however few and imperfect, of knowing His will. Perhaps also, in the intermediate state, further opportunities of instruction to salvation may be afforded to those who, through the arrangement of Divine Providence, were deprived of Christian privileges in the present world : the Judge of all the earth will assuredly do right, though the way and means may now be hidden from His short-sighted creatures.

On reviewing therefore the teaching of S. Paul, we see no reason to depart from the ordinary belief of the Church, that the doctrine of God's predestination is not contradictory to man's free-will and the possibility of a final fall from grace.

" The grey-haired saint may fail at last,
The surest guide a wanderer prove,
Death only binds us fast
To the bright shore of love."

"Then I saw," says even the Calvinistic Bunyan, "that there was a way to hell even from the gates of heaven, as well as from the City of Destruction."

The spiritual teaching, if it may be so termed, of S. Paul has now been explained and illustrated ; but it has been too often forgotten that the quotations already given from the Apostle's writings only partially represent his teaching, and that his theology will be wholly misunderstood, if such portions are exclusively brought forward—we shall now, therefore, complete our sketch by further quotations from the Apostle's writings, which the professed advocates of his teaching have too often ignored, or attempted to explain away ; the extracts alluded to have an important bearing upon the doctrinal system of S. Paul, and exhibit its true meaning and import.

The teaching of S. Paul on the following subjects shall be brought forward : (1) Holy Baptism ; (2) the Holy Eucharist ; (3) the Unity of the Church ; (4) one faith and the Apostolical Succession ; (5) Sacramental grace ; (6) Tradition ; (7) Celibacy ; (8) Fasting ; (9) Clerical bigamy ; (10) the Judgment-day purification ; (11) CHRIST'S Second coming.

(1.) We shall show from the Epistles of S. Paul that he teaches most explicitly the doctrine of baptismal regeneration. On his conversion, Ananias bade him be baptized and wash away his sins. (Acts xxii. 16.) In his Epistle to the Romans, he teaches that we are buried with CHRIST, and also rise with Him, (vi. 1, 3, 4, 11;) to the Galatians, that by baptism we put on CHRIST, (iii. 27;) and in his Epistle to Titus, that God hath saved us and called us with a holy calling by the washing of regeneration, (iii. 5—7.) But these, and similar passages which abound in the Apostle's writings, by no means exhaust our proof of his teaching; he continually, as Dr. Pusey¹ has shown, under different forms of expression, inculcates the same doctrine—it is the foundation of all his teaching. And yet as we know in our Church there are many professing an especial regard for the Apostle's teaching who repudiate the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, denying, of course, that this doctrine is really taught by S. Paul. Now what is the reason of this? does it tend to throw any doubt whatever upon our proof of the Apostle's teaching? Is it, we ask, in any degree uncertain whether or not he teaches the doctrine of Baptismal regeneration? There is no doubt whatever, we reply, both from the proof already given, and from further evidence which could easily be adduced. The Evangelical party referred to do not really deny this doctrine from a want of Scriptural evidence, but mainly from certain subjective reasons as they are called. No spiritually-minded man, they will say, could possibly believe the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, and therefore it could not have been held and taught by S. Paul, and the alleged Scriptural evidence in proof of the doctrine must necessarily be misapplied or misinterpreted. Be it so; but let it at the same time be remembered that others with whom the party alluded to have very little sympathy, who reject the doctrine of the atonement, have pleaded in defence of their opinions the same arguments or reasonings. The Rationalists to whom we allude reject this doctrine, (the atonement,) mainly on subjective grounds, as being contrary, they allege, to the justice of God, i.e., to the view or opinion which themselves hold of His justice; they may attempt, though very feebly, to refute the Scriptural proof of the doctrine, as e.g., by saying that the Apostles being Jews borrowed expressions as might have been expected from the Levitical ritual, and hence we find in their writings sacrificial expressions and ideas which cannot be literally understood; but their chief reason is the one which has been stated. Just so the Evangelical rarely, or very feebly, attempts to adduce Scriptural evidence in disproof of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, but really relies upon the reasons already given. We assert, without fear of contradiction, that the doctrine of baptismal regeneration is taught by S. Paul quite as explicitly as he teaches the doctrine

¹ Scriptural Views of Holy Baptism, p. 93, et seq.

of the atonement, and that the only reasons which can be given authorizing us to reject the one doctrine, will be equally cogent and an equally satisfactory plea for our rejection of the other.

But whilst maintaining that the Apostle teaches most explicitly the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, we think it right to say at the same time, that the regeneration to which he refers is the regeneration of adults, nor is there any reason to think that in his Epistles there is allusion to the regeneration of infants. This will be evident if we consider S. Paul's language respecting regeneration and the regenerate. Thus in most passages in which regeneration is alluded to, there cannot be any reference to infants. The Apostle says, e.g., that "the love of God is shed abroad in our hearts by the HOLY GHOST, which is given us;" that "we rejoice in God through our LORD JESUS CHRIST, by whom we have received the atonement;" he speaks also of spiritual understanding (Ephes. i. 18,) as the gift of holy Baptism, "the eyes of your understanding being enlightened;" see also Coloss. ii. 2, where the Apostle mentions the full assurance of understanding with a manifest allusion to baptismal grace; and in Acts xxvi. it is said that S. Paul was sent to the Gentiles "to turn them from darkness to light and from the power of Satan unto God." The teaching of the Apostle on the true nature of baptismal grace may be illustrated from the account which S. Cyprian has given us of his own experience of its blessed effects. Thus after relating the sinfulness of his former life, and his hopeless abandonment to evil habits, he adds, "But after that life-giving water succoured me, washing away the stain of former years and pouring into my cleansed and hallowed breast the light which comes from heaven; after that I drank in the heavenly Spirit, and was created into a new man by a second birth; then, marvellously, what before was doubtful became plain to me—what was hidden was revealed—what was dark began to shine—what was before difficult had now a way and means—what had seemed impossible could now be achieved—what was in me of the guilty flesh now confessed that it was earthly—what was quickened in me by the HOLY GHOST had now a growth according to God. Thou knowest well thou canst recollect as well as I what was then taken from me, and what was given by that death of sin, that quickening power of holiness."² Such are the effects of baptism upon the penitent and believing adult, and illustrations to the same effect might be added from many modern instances. The teaching of S. Paul on Holy Baptism is manifestly the same. Now it is certain that such visible effects are not seen in the baptism of an infant, hence our Evangelical brethren in contradiction

¹ We have no wish to deny that the usage of infant baptism may have prevailed during the Apostolic age; we merely assert that their regeneration is not alluded to in S. Paul's Epistles.

² Treatise 1 (Oxf. trans.)

to the clearest and most explicit statement of S. Paul, deny that regeneration takes place in baptism; it is not merely a doctrine, they will say, which a spiritually-minded man must necessarily reject, but it is also contradictory to the Apostle's own statements; certain visible effects according to his teaching accompany regeneration, and as such effects do not follow baptism as now administered to infants, therefore regeneration cannot be connected with baptism. But what is the necessary sequence of this argument if really valid? a rejection, we reply, of infant baptism itself. Since, if the baptism of an adult be accompanied with the highest spiritual gifts and blessings—spiritual gifts too, necessary for everlasting salvation—and the baptism of an infant be devoid of such inestimable blessings, is not the baptism of an infant manifestly unjustifiable, since we thus deprive him of the best spiritual gifts, and as baptism cannot be repeated the wrong and injury done to him are irrecoverable? Thus if an infant be not regenerated in baptism and receive therein the same inestimable blessings as the adult, we should act most unjustifiably in baptizing him instead of deferring the Sacrament to a riper age. A denial of the doctrine of baptismal regeneration must therefore necessarily lead to a rejection of infant baptism. The truth of this remark has been proved by modern instances, as in the case of the Rev. Baptist Noel, who, on seceding from the Church of England mainly on account of her teaching on baptismal grace, afterwards with undoubted consistency joined a sect which rejects infant baptism (the Baptists.) But what are the effects of regeneration in an infant? if not substantially the same, we remarked, as in the case of an adult, their baptism would plainly be an act of the greatest wrong and injustice. The presence of the HOLY GHOST in regeneration can only be manifested very differently in a conscious and intellectual adult, and in a passive and unconscious infant—but the regeneration of both must be and is the same—and what is regeneration? all its blessings are summed up in the very word; it is a new birth—a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness; the washing away of sin, whether original or actual, a creation in the Divine image, union with CHRIST, yea, the indwelling of FATHER, SON, and HOLY GHOST in the new-born soul. This is the meaning of regeneration whether in an adult or infant, though in the latter case, the gifts of grace are in what may be called a seminal state, and can only be fully developed in after life. Once more; we must most emphatically condemn the opinion or theory of certain modern writers who have asserted that regeneration means only a change of state. It is unfortunately too common in the present day for writers of unsound opinions to make use of the phraseology of the Church, affixing to it a new and peculiar sense of their own; thus whilst really opposing the teaching of the Church they deceive others, and often gain a hearing from sound Churchmen, by mere

verbal and nominal orthodoxy. It is only necessary to remark that this novel view of regeneration is wholly opposed to the doctrine of the Church and of Holy Scripture; indeed, the theory simply owes its origin to the ingenuity of certain writers who have invented it to suit the exigencies of modern controversy!

(2.) Again, the doctrine of the Real Presence is clearly taught by the Apostle S. Paul; his reasoning in the eleventh chapter of I. Corinthians could have no weight or meaning unless on the supposition of CHRIST's Real Presence in the Blessed Sacrament; were it a mere sign or memorial, how could the unworthy communicant be guilty of the Body and Blood of the LORD? (ver. 27;) the Apostle's language would be unmeaning except on the supposition of the Real Presence. The meaning of another verse in the previous chapter is very explicit, "The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the Body of CHRIST; and the wine which we drink, the communion of the Blood of CHRIST?" (x. 16.) "Wherefore," says S. Chrysostom, "saith he not the participation? because he intended to express something more, and to point out how close was the union, in that we communicate not only by participating and partaking, but also by being united. For as that body is united by CHRIST, so also are we united to Him by this bread."¹

It has often been a matter of surprise to the writer that distinguished authors of various sects who professedly disbelieve the doctrine of the Real Presence, yet really and most explicitly teach this doctrine in hymns written for public worship, in which, we might suppose, their own peculiar views would be clearly and guardedly stated. Thus Doddridge, a minister of the Independent sect, teaches the Catholic doctrine in his well-known hymn:

"Hail, sacred feast, which JESUS makes
Rich banquet of His flesh and blood."

The poet Cowper also, the writer with Newton, of the Olney hymns, states most explicitly the same doctrine, (Hymn 27,)

"This is the feast of heavenly wine,
And GOD invites to sup;
The juices of the living Vine,
Were press'd to fill the cup.²
Oh bless the SAVIOUR, ye that eat,
With royal dainties fed;
Not heaven affords a costlier treat,
For JESUS is the bread."³

¹ Comment. in loc. (Oxf. trans.)

² Thus also S. Chrysostom: "This, which is in the cup, is that which flowed from His side, and of that do we partake." (Comment. in loc. hom. xxiv.)

³ S. Augustine says: "The bread is the Body of CHRIST." (Tom. v. c. 1246.)
"What is laid on God's altar is CHRIST." (Tom. iii. tract 45, § 9.)

Now what is the reason of this manifest inconsistency—that men should contradict in their writings their own professed belief or tenets? It can only be accounted for by the fact that the Scriptural proof of this doctrine is clear and explicit; and that when writers like Doddridge or Cowper who profess to receive the teaching of Scripture only, forget the peculiar views of their own sect or party and turn their attention solely to Scriptural language and illustrations, they must necessarily teach the doctrine of the Real Presence, for such is the teaching of Scripture itself if taken in its obvious and ordinary meaning without comment or attempted explanation. We cannot otherwise account for the inconsistency of these writers, and also of other sects which might be quoted.

The doctrine of the Real Presence underlies all Catholic teaching, and it is hardly possible to overrate its importance. How necessary then is it, not only that the doctrine should be taught explicitly, but that our clergy should give undoubted proof of their belief in the celebration of the holy Mysteries? It cannot be doubted that in the earliest ages of the Church, a reverence was shown to the Blessed Eucharist and the vessels, linen clothes, &c., used in its celebration,¹ which amongst ourselves would too generally be considered most grossly superstitious, or even idolatrous; and yet this reverence would appear necessarily to follow from a

¹ The reverence paid to the Blessed Eucharist in primitive times may be illustrated from the following canons of the Eastern and Western Church:—"Sacerdos qui offert et ceciderit de manibus ejus Eucharistia in terra, et non invenerit illam, scopis munda scopet et comburat igne, et abscondat cineres ejus in terra, et dimidium annum poeniteat. Si autem invenerit locum similiter faciat et poeniteat quadraginta diebus. Si autem usque ad altare ceciderit uno die poeniteat. Si vero declinaverit in terra [scil. sanguis CHRISTI] lingua sua lingat. Si fuerit tabularum. Si non fuerit, mittat tabulam ut non conculcetur sanguis CHRISTI, quadraginta diebus. Si autem super altare ceciderit stilla sorbeat illam et tres dies poeniteat. . . ." Sacramentum Gallicanum, n. xlv. The canons of the Eastern Church are of a like nature: "Unusquisque summam curam adhibebit ne quis infidelis ad communionem Sacramentorum admittatur; ut etiam ne mus aut aliud animal ad ea accedat aut aliquid decidat, et peccet cum sit Corpus CHRISTI et sanguis ejus. . . . Cave igitur quicumque sis, sedulo, ne quid ex eo (sanguine CHRISTI) effundatur, ne cum immundi spiritus polluant neque is esto qui asperneris sanguinem CHRISTI, reus sis tanquam contemptor illius sanguinis quo redemptus es." In Quæsitis et responsis De Jure, statuitur sacerdotem cujus negligentia aliquid ex corpore aut sanguine CHRISTI ceciderit super altare aut extra vel in sacra vestimenta, *abstinere per quadraginta dies ab altaris ministerio et communione jejunareque per illud tempus, &c.** The reader will probably remember the well known passage of Tertullian, "Calicis aut panis nostri aliquid decuti in terram *ansie patimur.*"† A striking passage relating to this subject also occurs in an Epistle of S. Jerome: "Eruditi testimoniis Scripturarum qua debeant veneratione Sancta suscipere et altaris CHRISTI ministerio deservire; sacrosque calices et sancta velamina et cætera quæ ad cultum Dominicæ pertinent passionis, non quasi inania et sensu carentia sanctimoniam non habere; sed ex consortio corporis et sanguinis Domini, eadem quæ corpus ejus et sanguis majestatem veneranda."‡

* Renaudot, *Liturgiarum Orientalium, Coll. tom. 1.* Commentarius ad Liturgiam Copticam S. Basilii, p. 269. (1847.)

† De Corona, c. iii.

‡ Ad Theophilum, Epist. cxiv. § 2.

belief of the doctrine of the Real Presence. Nor can it be doubted that the too frequent want among ourselves of due reverence in celebrating—or even instances which sometimes occur, we might add, of gross desecration¹—has tended to produce that general disbelief of the true doctrine which unhappily prevails in the English Church.

Again; S. Paul teaches the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice; he says, that Christians have an altar, (Heb. xiii. 10,) and it is remarkable that S. Paul should be the only inspired writer of the New Testament who calls the holy table an altar; his writings having been especially quoted as being contradictory to the Catholic doctrine of the priesthood and the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Epistle to the Hebrews in which the term "altar" is found, has been supposed most emphatically to contradict this doctrine; but Johnson,² and other writers, have clearly shown that the one offering of CHRIST, which the Apostle so frequently asserts, (x. 10, 12, 14,) solely refers to CHRIST's bloody oblation upon the Cross, which is not inconsistent with, but rather implies the continual offering of the same sacrifice (in an unbloody manner,) upon the altar, that thus the bloody oblation upon Calvary may be perpetually represented, not in figure merely, but by the presence of the Reality itself, and its blessings of pardon and sanctification conveyed to the souls of the faithful.

But it may be said that we are laying great stress upon, as it were, an *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*, the altar being only once mentioned by S. Paul. The existence of Judaism, we reply, rendered unlikely a frequent and distinct allusion to the altar in the Apostolic writings. Judaism was of divine institution, the type, as we remarked, of a higher dispensation to come, nor could it be expected that whilst the type still existed, the antitype would appear either prominently or in its full developement. During the time when all the books of the New Testament, except the Apocalypse, were written, the temple with its divinely-appointed service still existed, and S. Paul, as we know, conformed to the existing usages of Judaism which still remained, though in a decaying and half-perishing state, till the destruction of the temple at Jerusalem and the final destruction of the Jewish polity and worship.

Hence, though it cannot be doubted that the Eucharistic Sacrifice was offered from the time of its institution by our Blessed LORD, there is only a rare and indistinct allusion to it in the New Testament. The typical dispensation, be it remembered, still ex-

¹ The writer remembers when a deacon in his first curacy, that it was the custom of his incumbent to leave the altar after Holy Communion and return to the vestry, bringing with him the remains of the consecrated Bread and Wine; the latter, sometimes a large quantity, was usually drunk by the incumbent and the churchwardens; before drinking they proposed each other's health; the churchwardens taking the opportunity to amuse the vicar with current stories of village scandal, &c.

² *Unbloody Sacrifice*, c. ii. sec. 1. (Anglo-Cath. ed.)

isted ; it was the ordinance of GOD, and had not been abolished by His direct command and authority. It is a startling fact (much more remarkable than the infrequent allusion in the New Testament to the Eucharistic Sacrifice) that the Apostles, even after our LORD'S Ascension, when the Church was founded, and it might have been thought that the types and shadows of the preparatory dispensation had necessarily become extinct, still frequented the services and sacrifices of the Temple, and appeared to think that an adherence to Judaism was not inconsistent with the Christian faith. The Lamb of GOD had now appeared, and taken away sin by the sacrifice of Himself. How then could the Apostles be still in bondage to the weak and beggarly elements of the Law ? How could they offer Jewish sacrifices, and be sprinkled with the blood of bulls and calves, which "could never take away sin," when the LORD had offered His propitiatory Sacrifice, and instituted a priesthood to perpetuate in His Church the all-availing offering ? If we bear in mind a fact of which traces continually occur in the Apostolic writings, that the prejudices of the Jewish Christians were most stubborn and almost invincible, and that till the destruction of Jerusalem the Hebrew believers might almost be called Judaic Christians, and seem only to have embraced Christianity on condition of being allowed to comply with Jewish observances ; if we also bear in mind the great and almost insuperable difficulty of teaching men entirely imbued with Jewish notions and prejudices, and whose only idea of sacrifice was the oblation of brute animals, the awful and spiritual reality of the unbloody offering ; if we bear these considerations in mind, it will not be a matter of surprise if the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice is not brought forward with that prominence and distinctness which, as we should think, its importance demands ; but was only inculcated with much reserve and caution till the destruction of the Jewish temple and the extinction of its sacrificial worship.

One book of the New Testament, however, was written after the destruction of Jerusalem, and it is necessary to speak a few words respecting it in order to understand the teaching of S. Paul. The Apocalypse of S. John had no connection whatever with the Christian priesthood, and yet the reasons for reserve in the inculcation of this doctrine had almost or entirely disappeared. Hence we find the "altar" introduced into Apocalyptic visions (vi. 9, viii. 3, ix. 13,) and if we consider that the Jewish priesthood was now abolished, it can hardly be doubted that the Christian altar is the basis upon which these visions were founded. Their *apparently* Jewish form—the delineation of the heavenly worship after the model of the temple service—can hardly be considered as indicating a wish to recommend to Christians, or even to bring under their notice, the dispensation of Judaism, against which the Hebrew converts needed especial warning, and which, in contrast with Christianity,

is spoken of by S. Paul in terms of disparagement; but can only be regarded as a fresh proof of that close resemblance (upon which we have dwelt already) between Christianity and its antitype. The form of these visions *must appear to be Jewish, if it be really Christian*. Behold the scene which is presented before us in one of the Apocalyptic visions. In the sixth chapter the worship of the Church in heaven is delineated as best suited to the understanding and realisation of the faithful, under the form of the worship of the Church on earth; or rather we may say, there *is* an actual resemblance between them—the one the all-glorious reality, the other its imperfect but true representation. The throne of God is seen in vision by the Apostle, and before it an altar,¹ upon which is our LORD under the form of a *Lamb as it had been slain*—the same propitiatory offering which is presented upon the earthly altar, the fountain of pardon and benediction for the Church. Around the altar are the four and twenty elders, typifying the priesthood upon earth, who offer incense and worship. “They fall down before the Lamb, having every one of them harps, and golden vials full of odours, which are the prayers of saints, and they sing a new song. . . . Thou wast slain and hast redeemed us to God by Thy blood out of every kindred and tongue and people and nation, and hast made us unto our God kings and priests, and we shall reign on the earth.”

(*To be continued.*)

DR. SHIRLEY'S LECTURE ON SCHOLASTICISM.

Scholasticism: a Lecture delivered before the University of Oxford, January 27, 1866. By W. W. SHIRLEY, D.D., Regius Professor of Ecclesiastical History, and Canon of Christ Church. Parker and Co., Oxford and London.

It is very long since we have read anything with such interest as this lecture. By slow degrees persons have learnt to appreciate the art of the Middle Ages, as well as the energy with which their Missionaries propagated the faith among the barbarian nations of Europe. But “Scholasticism!” What is it? and in what light

¹ Though the Lamb is said to be in the midst of the Throne, (v. 6,) He is not represented as being upon the Throne, since it is said (ver. 7) “He came and took the book out of the hand of Him that *sat on the Throne*.” Thus it is evident that the vision does not represent our LORD as standing upon the Throne, but as being near it. Now before the throne it is said, shortly afterwards, (viii. 3,) is the altar, upon which is offered incense with the prayers of the saints; and our LORD, it is obvious, is represented as being upon this altar, since it was “before the Lamb (v. 8) that the vials full of odours are offered which are the prayers of saints.”

should it be regarded? It is these questions that Professor Shirley has set himself to answer. Scholasticism, then, he tells us, was a system of theology elaborated from the writings of the Fathers by the vigorous intellects of the immigrant nations, who, for the purpose, borrowed the philosophy of Aristotle, and so founded a new consequential theology, which in earlier ages would have been impossible.

"The controversy of Lanfranc with Berengar on the subject of the Blessed Eucharist has justly been considered to mark the opening of a new period. Lanfranc marks his own sense of the unusual mode in which Berengar had conducted the controversy, when he reproaches him with desiring '*relictis sacris auctoritatibus ad dialecticam confugium facere.*' But he follows himself in the same steps; he no longer attempts, like a theologian of the previous period, to bear down his adversary with the dead weight of authority, but he answers dialectic with dialectic, and argues a point of theology upon the basis of pure reason. What Lanfranc had done reluctantly, and as it were by accident, his disciple Anselm did with the whole soul of a philosopher; and from that time the scholastic philosophy took firm root in Europe.

"The transformation which thus passed on the intellectual education of the western world is one of which it is scarcely possible to exaggerate the magnitude. It was an exchange of education by a dead literature for education by a living philosophy. In the mere externals of teaching the revolution was visible to the whole world. The old cathedral and monastic schools, valuable for their store of manuscripts, and capable at the worst of affording a plain instruction in grammar, were deserted for the new schools, which under the name of Universities arose in Italy, and France, and England. If the study of the day was to be, not the ancient authors but a living philosophy, the primary need was not an ample store of manuscripts, but the last and most celebrated teacher. Therefore it became necessary that students, instead of being scattered among the numerous monastic and cathedral schools, should be assembled at a few great centres, where the greatest possible number of pupils could have access to the lessons of the few men who had caught the ear of their day, and could advance the science which they taught. A corresponding necessity pressed upon the teachers themselves. Anselm himself at Bec found it almost impossible to receive the numbers who came to him for instruction: in the next generation a teacher of Anselm's celebrity would have been driven perforce to the new University of Paris, where alone at that time accommodation could be found for the growing concourse of students."

The way in which Dr. Shirley accounts for the uncritical character of the Schoolmen,—though perhaps the fact is a little exaggerated—is one of the most striking features in the lecture. There is, of course, nothing which the mind that wrote the "*Summa*" might not have achieved. But criticism was not required of the age, which was pressed by many more deep and anxious inquiries. These it was the business of the Schoolmen to

solve; and they did it in this way: By a sagacity or instinct of faith which may well be called superhuman, they accepted the dogmatic conclusions of S. Augustine and the other Fathers, and from them they deduced answers to the questions that pressed on them—whether relating to doctrines or morals. The celebrated maxim of S. Anselm, “Credo ut intelligam,” might be taken as the motto of the whole Scholastic theology—and surely a more noble maxim could not be imagined. Space will not permit us to enlarge on this subject, but we strongly recommend our readers to procure for themselves this lecture, which we look upon as augury of great good service to be done by its author.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *The Law and Usage of the Church of England on certain Disputed Points of Ritualism.* By JOHN HAMMOND, M.A. London: J. Masters.
2. *The Scriptural Rationale of Eucharistic Vestments.* By the Hon. and Rev. R. LIDDELL, M.A. London: J. T. Hayes.
3. *The Ritual Law and Custom of the Church Universal.* A Sermon, by J. JEBB, D.D., Rector of Peterstow. London: Rivingtons.

THESE are the most recent fruits of the Ritualistic Controversy, and we recommend them strongly to the attention of our readers. Mr. Liddell's Sermon, as the title shows, is limited to the single subject of vestments, and does not go beyond maintaining their legality, of which surely there can be no doubt, and deprecating any effort to forbid what there can be no question in a little time will be recognized by the great body even of moderate churchmen, as the just exponent of sound doctrine. Mr. Jebb's sermon is much fuller, and dives into many of the great principles both of Ecclesiastical Law and Ritualism. We fear, however, that the “Common Law” of the Church will not be recognised in the Courts.

But of all publications on this question, Mr. Hammond's strikes us as the most valuable that has yet appeared, both as touching on all the points now in dispute, and as discussing them with great fairness, and as looking chiefly to the law of the Church of England, as interpreted by recent decisions by the Court of Final Appeal. The question of Vestments need not be again alluded to. In vindicating two lights upon the altar, Mr. Hammond is of course required to consider the authority of Edward's Injunctions; he decides with Bishop Harold Browne, that the Privy Council in the S. Barnabas Case, decidedly admitted the validity of the Injunctions. This is really an important point. The “ceremonial use” of incense Mr. Hammond considers indefensible, and in so doing lays down the general principle.

“The lawfulness of the use of incense as a religious ceremony depends

upon the authority to be attributed to the ancient canons; a point on which I must say a few words. An important statute was passed in the 25th year of Henry VIII., and 'upon this enactment now depends the canon law of England.' Bishop Cosin in former times, Judge Coleridge and the Bishop of Exeter in later times, likewise recognise the authority of the old canon law. But here a very important question arises, viz., whether the use of additional ceremonies, not prescribed by the Prayer Book, be not a violation of the Act of Uniformity, and so 'contrariant to the laws and statutes of this realm.' I venture to state that the matter stands thus. Where our rubrics have left us in doubt, have imposed upon us the obligation of doing something, but have not told us what to do, or how to act, then we may lawfully be guided by the ancient canons and usages. But we are not at liberty, I conceive, to interrupt the definitely appointed services, in order that we may interject an additional ceremony, whatever authority or supposed authority such ceremony may possess."—Pp. 18, 19.

The pamphlet ends with an earnest plea for letting things alone.

The Claims of the Church upon the University. By T. E. ESPIN, B.D.
London: Rivingtons.

THIS very stirring sermon must have told with great effect, we feel sure, from the pulpit of the University, both on her senior and junior members. Towards the latter it is a very earnest call to seek the ministry of the Church from one who both knows its difficulties and its encouragements. Mr. Espin is a large-hearted man, but seems not yet to have appreciated the power which a soberly developed ritual is capable of exercising on the hearts of the industrial classes when fairly tried. At the same time he is fully alive to the deficiencies of our present Church system. One mournful fact he states as illustrating the results of rampant Evangelicalism in Birmingham, viz., that the number of Curates assisting the twenty-eight Incumbents of the Rural Deanery of Birmingham had actually *fallen* from twenty-nine in 1863, to seventeen in 1865. Such are the fruits of the work carried on with such zealous exclusiveness by Dr. Miller, Messrs. Bull, Thornton, &c., that the scheme of Church extension in that town has failed by reason of this clique insisting on the retention of all the patronage of her churches in their own hands. The most efficient means for increasing both the supply and the character of the clergy, in the judgment of Mr. Espin, would be the establishment of a Theological School as an alternative subject of study with modern history and science, and we confess ourselves that we are very much disposed to agree with him. Cambridge, it appears, has already adopted this system, and we believe that Oxford must follow the example. We borrow the account of the Cambridge Statute from a note appended to the Sermon.

"The new Statute recently passed by the Senate provides for a 'previous examination' at the end of the first of the three academical years, to be followed in the case of candidates for ordinary degrees by a 'general examination' in the second year: after which, at the end of the third year, students may choose out of the following special examinations: (1) Theology, (2) Moral Science, (3) Law, (4) Natural Science, (5) Mechanism and Applied Science. Those who pass in theology are to be 'ranged by the examiners in two classes,

the names in the first being arranged in order of merit, and those of the second alphabetically.'

"This Statute is most important. Its effect will be to limit the studies in 'Arts' of the 'Poll-men' to two years, and to enable them to give their last year at the University to subjects directly bearing on their future occupation in life. Cambridge has always supplied more candidates for Orders than Oxford, and must, with the aid of her new regulations, secure yet a larger proportion of students of this class, if the arrangements at Oxford are not so modified as to give an improved status and a regular and important place in the course of theology."—P. 20.

Mr. NUGGE, of Wymering, has commenced a series of Fly Sheets printed at a cheap rate, on matters both of Doctrine and Ritual. They may be procured at our publisher's, and are likely to be useful.

We have received from Mr. Macintosh a useful tract on Lent, *Read your heart, &c.*, which does not shrink from defending the practice of fasting.

"Common Sense" administers some hard hits to Dean Close for joining the "Association" against Ritual. (Palmer.) It is of course most monstrous to denounce Eucharistic vestments which were authorised and used by Cranmer and the other framers of Edward's First Book, as "Romanistic." At the same time the tract, we think, would have had more weight if it had been somewhat more temperately expressed.

An anonymous writer has broached two subjects of undoubted importance, viz., *Institution and Induction, or Things as they are and as they might be.* (Parker.) His wish is that they should both be done by the Bishop publicly in the church where the new Incumbent is to minister.

Meditations on the Passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, according to the Four Evangelists, (Masters,) is a translation from the Italian, and results from a visit paid to the Monte Cassino by the Bishop of BRECHIN, the Author being the Abbot of the Monastery, who presented to the Bishop the copy from which this translation is made. The work is very simple in its character, being intended chiefly for the young, but it will be found well suited for others who being much occupied can only take up a book at intervals.

The history of S. Augustine can never fail to attract readers, so we welcome another effort to popularize it by the Author of "*The Garden in the Wilderness.*" It is called, *S. Augustine the fruit of a Mother's Prayer*, and is published by Palmer.

We are glad to see that new editions have been called for both of Mr. BRUNT'S *Household Theology*, and Dr. GOULBURN'S *Personal Religion*, (Rivingtons,) and that they are issued in a cheaper form, so as to come within the reach of new classes of readers. The addition of a chapter on "Fasting," in the latter is specially noticeable; and there needs now only a reconsideration of the question of Confession—the value of which the author most strangely recognises, while he deprecates the practice of it—in order to make the book a really valuable treatise.

THE EVANGELICALS AND THE PRAYER BOOK.

The Book of Common Prayer, in its History and Interpretation; with special reference to points disputed in the present day. By the Rev. R. P. BLAKENEY, LL.D., Incumbent of Christchurch, Cloughton, Birkenhead. London: Miller.

IT has pleased GOD of late to stir up in the breasts of many members of the Church of England longing desires after unity. Feeling the duty imposed on them to re-echo the prayer of their LORD, that His people "may be one," their eyes have naturally been turned to the Churches of the East and West, whose communion with the Church of England has now for several centuries practically been interrupted. But at the same time unity has not been sought at the expense of truth. Dr. Pusey, in his "Eirenicon," speaks the mind of most of the unionist party in England, when, after showing that the decrees of the Council of Trent, if explained in such a sense by authority, might be made to speak a language not inconsistent with our own formularies, he manifests, in plain and uncompromising words, that there are modern innovations which it would be impossible for us to receive, and which the Church of Rome must leave us at liberty to reject, as one of the terms on which our renewed communion must rest.

This desire for union has not been one-sided or narrow. If we have not looked to the foreign Protestant communities, it was not because any body of professing Christians was beneath our notice, but because, in their present degraded state of faith and practice, communion with them must tend to impede, rather than promote, the Catholic union of Christendom. The reunion of the English and Roman Churches, if it should please GOD that it should ever be effected on terms which we can truthfully and honestly accept, would no doubt be followed by the return of the purer portion of Continental Protestants to the Catholic communion, on conditions similar to those which we should desire to obtain for ourselves; and therefore it is not true that our desires for unity have been turned in one direction only.

Equally is it without foundation that we have ignored the claims of that party within our own communion who arrogate to themselves the name of "*Evangelical*." When the essentials of our common faith were recently assailed, we were content to stand side by side with them in the combat, and they did not disdain our aid. With his usual largeness of heart Dr. Pusey did not forget them in his aspirations after unity.

"Ever since I knew them," he says, "(which was not in my earliest Vol. XXVIII.—APRIL, 1866. x

years,) I have loved those who called themselves Evangelicals. I have loved them, because they loved our LORD. I loved them for their zeal for souls. I often thought them narrow, yet I was often drawn to individuals among them more than to others, who held truths in common with myself, which the Evangelicals did not hold, at least explicitly. I believed them to be 'of the truth.' I have ever believed, and believe, that their faith was, and is, on some points of doctrine, much truer than their words. I believed, and believe, that they are often withheld from the clear and full sight of the truth by an inveterate prejudice that truth, as held by us, is united with error, or with indistinct acknowledgment of other truths which they themselves held sacred. Whilst, therefore, I lived in society, I ever sought them out, both out of love for themselves, and because I believed that nothing (with God's help) so dispels untrue prejudice as personal intercourse, heart to heart, with those against whom that prejudice is entertained. I sought to point out to them our common basis of faith."—*Eirenicon*, pp. 4, 5.

For some time, whilst a common danger threatened, there seemed to be a lull in the controversies which had their birth within the bosom of our own Church; for Rationalism was an exotic which was transplanted from a German soil, and Calvinism is not of native origin; but ever since the return of the exiles from the Continent at the accession of Elizabeth, it has been like the American weed which infests our rivers, obstructing their course, and needing from time to time to be cleared out. Controversies which have thence arisen have occupied the Church when she would otherwise have been at leisure for the great works which it is her duty to perform. Of late, however, the repulsive features of Calvinism have failed to draw recruits from amongst the earnest and more intelligent of the younger Clergy. In spite of all that has been done to place the leaders of this party in positions of power and authority, they feel that their influence is dying out; and instead of seeing that the time is come when, if they would do their LORD's work, which we verily believe they desire to do, they must give up their peculiar traditions, and unite with their brethren in a common cause, they are determined not to die without a sign. Of late they have been left in peace to follow their own devices; but the moderation and liberality with which they have been treated they refuse to extend to their brethren. They see that the preaching of High Churchmen is more influential; and that churches in which the service is conducted with due attention to ritual dignity are full, whilst their own bald and mutilated services attract but slender congregations. "*It stirs the bile*," says Mr. Stuart, and perhaps he has hit the right nail on the head; for very certain it is that the bile of the Evangelical Clergy is very considerably stirred. Trusting to the support of the Bishop of London and Lord Westmeath, they are certainly up and doing; and a regular crusade against "High Church practices" promises to be one of the chief ecclesiastical

divertissements of the present session of Parliament. The Bishop of London is convinced that the Prayer Book is against him, and was reported to be about to introduce an Act to alter the Rubrics to suit his own views; but this intention we believe he abandoned when he found that the general feeling of Churchmen was adverse to him. Dr. Blakeney is, however, of another opinion, and has written a big book to prove that the Prayer Book is with him. This at least seems, at a *prima facie* view, to be a happy circumstance; for if Dr. Blakeney can be convinced of his mistake, he must give up his cause, and pass over to the other side.

Dr. Blakeney's book is important, for not only is it ably written, but it is put forward as the exponent of the views of his party. The author appears to be secretary to the so-called "Church Association," and the papers which were recently circulated amongst the Clergy by that society were accompanied by a prospectus of his book. We suppose, therefore, that Dr. Blakeney's commentary has induced the Evangelical party to give up their demand for revision, and to rest satisfied with the Prayer Book as it is. If this was all, we should be perfectly content, and hail the discovery as an augury of future union; but unity is the last thing that Evangelicals desire. At the recent clerical meeting at Islington, amongst other signs of the degeneracy of our days, Mr. Daniel Wilson mentioned that "men now-a-days disliked the name of party, and would fain merge the entire professing Church in one brotherhood," to which result he considered the Church congresses, now annually held, had largely tended. We must confess that Dr. Blakeney's recent intemperate speeches have greatly detracted from the respect with which we otherwise should have reviewed his work. The coarse jokes which he has hazarded in his platform defence of Protestantism lead us to doubt, which we should not otherwise have done, whether he has really been in earnest in collecting the materials for his book. However this may be, we wish to treat him as if he were in earnest, and to weigh with becoming gravity every statement which he has advanced. Moreover, we will make allowance for his writing with a certain bias, feeling persuaded that we should have done the same, only our bias would have been in the contrary direction. Still further, we will tell him that, if he had proved his point, he would not have shaken our position, because the motives of the Reformers make little real difference, when we regard the reconstruction of the Prayer Book as overruled by God's Providence. The ancient services passed through a furnace, and came out refined and purified, even if in a few particulars they were shorn of some of their glory; and therefore the nature of the fuel with which the furnace was heated is a point of quite secondary consideration. If they were shorn of some of its ancient glory, we are willing to accept the loss at God's hands, not only submissively, but thankfully, considering how

many accretions of mundane growth were wiped away at the Reformation. All we claim is liberty to use the Prayer Book as it is, and to understand the Rubrics in their plain meaning, and not as they may have been evaded by some who would like to have carried the Reformation further.

Dr. Blakeney's thesis is that the compilers of the Prayer Book acted throughout on Calvinistic principles, and that what are commonly known as "*Church principles*" were unknown before the time of Laud. How he succeeds in his task it will be our business to show. We will begin at the beginning; and therefore, passing over two chapters on the necessity of reformation, in which we—and, we suppose, the Tridentine Fathers—are fully agreed with Dr. Blakeney, we take notice by the way of a little insinuation, which is of no importance except as a specimen of what we may expect to find in the course of the book. In 1537 the Bishops' Book, entitled the Institution of a Christian Man, was issued, and the title, says Dr. Blakeney, was not unlikely borrowed from Calvin's Institutes, which were published in the previous year. The similarity of title certainly would not seem to us a very remarkable coincidence, even if it were far greater than it is; but if the Bishops had heard of Calvin's book at this time, they probably had not perused it; or, if they had, it could have made no impression on them whatsoever, since with the title the similarity ceases altogether. The Bishops' book consisted of an exposition of the Creed, Seven Sacraments, and Ten Commandments, the Pater Noster and Ave Maria, with an article on Justification, which was translated from Luther's "*Loci Communes*," and another on Purgatory. "It defines," says Dr. Blakeney, "the Catholic Church as consisting of the elect, who shall never perish." By what process he deduces this definition, if he means it in a Calvinistic sense, we know not. The article on the Catholic Church is thus epitomised by Collier:—"It consists in the unity of faith, hope, and charity, and in the right use and administration of the Sacraments; and all the good gifts, works, and graces performed or conferred on any particular member will be universally serviceable, and applied to the benefit of the whole body." "Moreover, all particular Churches are parts of the Catholic Church." If such a deduction as Dr. Blakeney draws could possibly be extracted from it, the article would plainly contradict itself. But when we come to the book itself, we find that the Catholic Church is explained consistently with Scripture and with our own belief, and that Dr. Blakeney's definition is the mangled portion of a sentence:—

"This word Church in Scripture is taken sometimes generally for the whole congregation of them that be christened and profess CHRIST's Gospel; and sometimes it is taken for the Catholic congregation, or number of them only which be chosen, called, and ordained to reign with CHRIST in everlasting life."

Surely this is but an exposition of the twofold sense in which our **Lord** uses the term "kingdom of heaven."

From the summary of the next chapter we extract the following words :—

"An Office for Communion was published in March, 1548, and the First Book of Common Prayer was adopted throughout the country on the 9th of June, 1549. This service book being censured by Calvin, Bucer, and others, and Cranmer and the Reformers advancing in their views, a revision was completed in 1552, by which the Corporal Presence, the Altar, and the Sacrifice of the Altar, prayers for the dead, and other Romish opinions and practices, were rejected. An Act of Uniformity, April 6th, 1552, provided that the new book should be received by the whole Church on the feast of All Hallows. The Forty-two Articles having been agreed to, the Reformation was complete."—
P. 39.

Dr. Blakeney has overlooked the fact that the Act of Uniformity, which established the Second Book of Edward VI., called the First Book "a very godly order, agreeable to the Word of God and the primitive Church, very comfortable to all good people desiring to live in Christian conversation, and most profitable to the estate of this realm." Now Bucer and Calvin objected to this book because they did not consider it conformable to God's Word; but the preamble of the Act goes on to state that "*divers doubts had risen for the fashion and manner of administering the same rather by the curiosity of the minister, and mistakers, than of any other worthy cause.*" The Act was passed in the beginning of the year, but the introduction of the new service book was not to take effect until the feast of All Saints following, which shows that the Parliament did not believe that the people would take any harm from the use of the old one. The declaration on kneeling at the Holy Communion was added on the King's own authority, without the sanction either of Parliament or Convocation. It has over and over again been proved that the Articles have nothing of a Calvinistic savour belonging to them: on the contrary, they are a protest against the results of Calvinism. At Bucer's death the chair of Divinity at Cambridge was offered to Melancthon, and was kept vacant for two years in the hope that he might be induced to accept it. Peter Martyr and Bucer may be said rather to have sought refuge in England than to have been invited, owing to the persecution which their opposition to the Interim entailed; but the pressing invitation given to Melancthon shows that Calvinism had ceased to be in favour. If the Forty-two Articles, which are mainly identical with the Thirty-nine of Elizabeth, were Calvinistic, why should the Calvinists have pressed for the authorization of the Lambeth Articles? Why should 'A Lasco's congregation in London have claimed to be allowed to worship after their own form, if the spirit of our Prayer Book was

coincident with that of Calvin? Besides this, we must remember that Calvin and Bucer's strictures on the Prayer Book did not cause the emendations they proposed to be adopted, whilst the English Liturgy was bitterly denounced by Knox and his followers. The fierce disputes amongst the exiles at Frankfort respecting the use of the Prayer Book in the reign of Queen Mary, the notorious objections of Thomas Cartwright in the reign of Elizabeth, to which the immortal Ecclesiastical Polity of Hooker owes its origin, and the cavils of the Puritans at the Hampton Court Conference, are a sufficient answer to Dr. Blakeney's assertion that, up to the time of Laud, the Puritans considered the Prayer Book their own.

Another argument for the Calvinism of the Church of England employed by Dr. Blakeney is the schismatic position of the "Free-Willers." Evidently the Doctor has been caught by the name, and is in total ignorance of what were really the tenets of this sect, which were not Arminian, but strictly Pelagian, being in gross disparagement of a Redeemer's merits and a Sanctifier's help, and as such, were stoutly combated by the Reformers of our Church. A letter of Cranmer's to Cromwell is quoted by Blunt to show the Archbishop's own opinion of Free Will, which was the reverse of Calvinism.

"At April next coming it shall be three years since the said Sir Thomas fell into despair, and thereby into a sickness, so that he was in peril of death. Of this sickness, within a quarter of a year, he recovered, but saith he is assured he shall be perpetually damned. My chaplains and divers other learned men have reasoned with him, but can bring him to no other opinion, but that he, like unto Esau, was created unto damnation; and hath, divers times and sundry ways, attempted to kill himself; but by diligent looking unto hath hitherto been preserved."—*Blunt's Reformation in England*, p. 228.

Of Queen Elizabeth's reign Dr. Blakeney says,—

"Differences of doctrine were at length introduced by Overall, Andrewes, and others. Calvinism, however, retained its ascendancy in the Church of England throughout the reign of Elizabeth, as is evident from the creation of the Lambeth Articles and other circumstances."

We assert in reply, that the creation of the Lambeth Articles proved nothing of the kind. Many of the exiles had returned from Geneva deeply impregnated with Calvinism, and were constantly struggling for ascendancy; but what did they effect? Travers' complaint to the Council against Hooker only resulted in the increase of Hooker's fame. Harsnet's denunciation of Calvinism at Paul's Cross in 1584 was uncensured; and now it was when the doctrine of Predestination, which had been brought from Geneva and propagated in the Margaret Professor's chair, had gained great footing at Cambridge, that an attempt was made by the Calvinists

to obtain legal authority for their tenets. If they had been satisfied with the XXXIX. Articles they would scarcely have run the risk of exposing themselves to the charge of introducing novelties. Dr. Whitaker went up from Cambridge and talked over Archbishop Whitgift, who, with all his great and amiable qualities had scarcely sufficient strength of character for the difficulties of his time. No Bishop assisted in the drawing up of the Lambeth Articles. Two Bishops elect and one Dean were certainly present, but the rest were divines who had been sent from Cambridge for the purpose. The Queen, when she heard of the affair, was highly incensed, and it was some time before she could be persuaded to hear the Archbishop's defence; but when she did, Whitgift excused himself by saying, "that neither himself nor the other divines had made any canons or articles for a standing rule or direction to the Church, but that their design was only to settle some propositions to be sent to Cambridge for quieting some unhappy differences in that University." The Queen thereupon commanded the Archbishop to suppress these articles with all expedition, and the order was so carefully executed that not a single copy was to be met with for some time afterwards. (See Collier, vii. 187.)

So much for Dr. Blakeney's premises! He tells us, moreover, that the Lambeth Articles were approved by Archbishop Hutton, of York. Unfortunately, however, for Dr. Blakeney's diligence of research, (we hesitate to say veracity,) he has evidently been misinformed. Archbishop Hutton was too cautious to commit himself. He wrote to Whitgift, telling him that having a copy of the Lambeth Articles, he intended to have offered some remarks on them *seriatim*, but on further consideration he laid this method aside, for fear lest some people, for whom he had a great regard, should be exasperated. He delivered his own opinion on Predestination, but whether he had meant at first to censure or approve the articles it is quite impossible to conclude. Certainly, whatever his original intention had been, no one can discover it from his letter. Respecting the suppression of the articles Dr. Blakeney is perfectly silent, and therefore we may well ask, to what cause can this silence be attributed?

The other circumstance proving the dominance of Calvinism in the reign of Elizabeth is simply the fact that Bullinger's *Decades* were approved by Convocation, but the chance commendation of a book which was never attended to and never repeated, is a very slender foundation for so large an assertion.

Two chapters follow on the influence of the foreign Divines, and another on the doctrinal views of our own Reformers. To examine these would lead us into a field too wide for contraction into a single article. Mr. Beadon Heathcote's "*Documentary Illustrations of the XXXIX. Articles*" will open another view to Dr. Blakeney, if he will take the trouble to consult it. The authorized docu-

ments of the time would, we think, be a more reliable authority than Mr. Maskell's statements, made at a time when he was desirous of throwing all discredit he could on the English Church.

The summary of the ninth chapter contains the following assertions, which, for the sake of brevity, we quote in preference to the statements contained in the text :

"There was, as yet, no difference between Churchmen and Puritans on doctrinal points, but Laud succeeded in effecting great innovations both in discipline and teaching. King Charles supported Laud, and a moral revolution took place in the Church, the precursor of rebellion in the State. Altars were everywhere set up, the Irish Articles were laid aside, and an attempt was made to force a retrogressive liturgy upon the Church of Scotland. The Romanists were so pleased that a Cardinal's hat was offered to Laud, who, while he maintained that the Church of Rome is a true Church, denied that Protestant Churches, non-episcopal, are true."—P. 113.

In the first place we ask ; has not this always been the case with the Puritans ? Have they not always attacked points of ritual and ceremony instead of making an onset on the doctrine of the Church ? Why did they attack them ? but because they believed the rites of which they disapprove were significant of doctrines which they did not receive ? And why did Churchmen refuse to yield to the bidding of the Puritans ? but because they were determined not to surrender the doctrines which were enshrined in the ritual. On any other consideration the conduct of both parties would be indefensible, for each would have been contending about mere forms, when they ought to have accommodated themselves to each other's prejudices.

When it was possible, this accommodation was made, but when it was not, Churchmen stood their ground. Was Laud an innovator ? Had he written anything respecting Episcopacy which Saravia and Bancroft had not written before, and which was not most explicitly declared in the preface to the ordinal. "When Laud was himself raised to power, in the place of Abbot, Archbishop of Canterbury," says Dr. Blakeney, "he carried matters with a high hand. The tables were removed from the middle of the churches and placed in the chancel." The Doctor forgets that the rubric required that "the chancels are to remain as they have done in times past," and Queen Elizabeth's injunctions ordered that the holy table should be placed where the high altar had formerly stood ; and all that Archbishop Laud did was to put in force the law already existing by enjoining that the holy table should be placed against the wall at the east end of the chancel. We can give no account of the rubric which permitted the holy table to be placed in the body of the Church, except that its retention was an oversight, or else that it was suffered to remain to avoid giving

offence to the Puritan party. From Hooker's mention of the chancel and its use, we may conclude that in Elizabeth's time her njunction was obeyed, and that the chancel was the place of celebration.

The charge of Romanizing brought by Dr. Blakeney is supported by the conduct of the Archbishop at the consecration of a church, but the Doctor is not aware that Bishops have always been privileged to use their own Pontifical, and that the consecration service, now used by our Bishops, only rests on their own private authority. There are other special services which the Church has never either repudiated or acknowledged. There is the Coronation service, for instance, in which the word altar is still retained, and the presentation of gold, frankincense, and myrrh, by the Sovereign at the Chapel Royal on the Feast of Epiphany, which is a ceremony still in use. The Bishop of Salisbury's dedication of a bell at Sherborne, on a recent occasion, was made sport of by the *Record*, but no one attempted to deny his right to use whatever service he pleased on the occasion.

As to the change of the Irish Articles, neither Laud nor the English Bishops had anything to do with it. In 1615, under the auspices of Usher, the Lambeth Articles, which had been suppressed by Elizabeth and rejected at the Hampton Court Conference, were received by the Irish Church; but in 1634, when it was proposed to ratify these articles, it was suggested that such a ratification would imply a want of authority in the former Convocation, and then it was proposed, that for the sake of unity the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England should be received instead, which act implicitly annulled the former Articles. If this is held to be the case, the substitution of the English Articles was the free act of the Irish Church, or if, as some assert, the Lambeth Articles are still in force, although they are not subscribed by the Irish clergy, Dr. Blakeney's charge falls to the ground.

Nor is the charge against Archbishop Laud of attempting to force a retrogressive Liturgy on the Church of Scotland supported by any testimony. If Dr. Blakeney had studied the history of the conflict, he would have known that what Archbishop Laud wished to force on the Scottish clergy was the English office, as it was sanctioned by law in England, and ordered by King James I. to be used in the royal chapel at Holyrood. The Scotch office had a Scottish origin, and was only substituted for the English at the desire of the Scottish Bishops, who feared that the introduction of the English Book would seem to be an act of subservience to the English Church. The office was prepared in Scotland, and submitted to the King, who referred it for review to Laud, Juxon, and Wren, who gave it their approbation when they saw that Wederburn, who had the chief hand in the performance, had mostly followed the model of the English Prayer Book. The alterations

subsequently made appear to have been suggested by Wederburn, and with these alterations it received the royal sanction.

Respecting the offer of a Cardinal's hat to Laud we cannot do better than quote the words of Mr. Perry, both as the conclusion of a learned historian and as that of one who is no partial admirer of Laud.

"The story that he was twice offered a Cardinal's hat is known to every reader of any of his biographies, as also the answer with which he refused it, that 'somewhat dwelt within him which would not suffer that till Rome were other than it is.' There can be scarce any doubt that the offer was not a *bonâ fide* one, but only designed to prejudice the Archbishop with the nation, and thus to nourish the ill-feeling and feuds which were already rife in the bosom of the Church. Laud was well known as the determined opponent of the Jesuit Fisher. His book of the controversy between them had been printed in 1624, and it was pronounced by a vigorous but honest opponent of the Archbishop's, a book that 'had muzzled the Jesuits, and one which shall strike the Papists under the fifth rib-when he is dead and gone.' It was not for the interest of the Romanist party in England that Laud should be able to plead a merit so great in the eyes of the Puritan, as that of being a determined foe to the Jesuit and the Pope. Hence, doubtless, the crafty offer of the Cardinal's hat."—*Perry's History of the Church of England*, Vol. i. 546.

In chapter x. Dr. Blakeney asserts—

"The declaration against the corporal presence and the ubiquitarian doctrine was restored. The Laudians, who came into power with the King were few in number, while the great body of the Church was opposed to the Laudian system of which, also, Parliament manifested a vigilant jealousy. The Church, in the reign of Charles II. retained much of the Puritanism of the Commonwealth, and the animus of 1661 was the very opposite to Laudian. We are indebted to this era for one of our greatest Protestant bulwarks—the above declaration."

In the first place, we have to remark that the House of Convocation which must be taken as a fair representation of the feelings of the clergy, not only reviewed and passed the revised Prayer Book before it was submitted to Parliament, but retained many of the expressions which the Commissioners had agreed to concede. The Bishops, for instance, had agreed to give up the words "sure and certain" in the burial service, and to substitute "honour" for "worship" in the marriage service, but the Convocation did not sanction either of these alterations. Respecting the temper of Convocation and Parliament Dr. Cardwell says,—

"The substitution of 'Church' for 'congregation,' the specific mention of 'Bishops, Priests, and Deacons,' instead of a more general designation, the re-introduction of *Bel* and the *Dragon* into the calendar, and other similar alterations, though none of them new in principle,

seemed designed to convince the nonconformists that instead of any wish to admit them to further powers or privilege within the Church, there was a distinct and settled desire to restrain or exclude them. So strongly did they feel this conviction, that it was proposed *on their behalf* in the House of Lords, *that the existing Liturgy should be continued, and all the corrections made in Convocation should be abandoned.*"—*Cardwell's Conferences*, p. 389.

The "re-introduction of the declaration against the corporal presence and ubiquitarian doctrine" is scarcely an accurate statement, and before Dr. Blakeney publishes it again, we recommend him to peruse the very learned and exhaustive essay on this subject by Mr. Perry of Brighton, which we had occasion to review some time since. In its original form it was printed in the Second Book of Edward VI. on no other authority than the king's own. It was intended as a denial of the carnal and Capernaite notions of the real presence which were then prevalent, but could not have been meant to deny that CHRIST was really, though spiritually present in the Eucharist, because Cranmer and Ridley distinctly held this doctrine. Ridley's doctrine of the Holy Eucharist was borrowed from Bertram, who taught it most plainly. The declaration was discarded in Elizabeth's time, because "real and essential" were inaccurate expressions and might be misunderstood to imply a denial of the true doctrine of the Eucharist, and when it was restored in another form in the reign of Charles II. all objection was removed by substituting the word "corporal," i.e., carnal, for "real and essential;" and the natural inference to be drawn from the alteration is that the Bishops and Convocation who revised the Prayer Book still believed that CHRIST was really and essentially present in the Holy Eucharist.

As it would be impossible to answer Dr. Blakeney's statements within the limits of this article, we must anticipate their order, by producing some assertions from the second part. At p. 402 we read, "No bodily presence. The comparison of the two books preceding proves that the doctrine of a bodily presence had been carefully extruded from the services of the English Church (1) in the modifications of the prayers and rubrics, and (2) in the declaration appended to the service."

Dr. Blakeney is fond of an ambiguous middle term, from which arises a considerable amount of difficulty in reasoning with him. If he means "bodily presence" in a Capernaite sense, of course we agree with him; but no English divine, past or present, has ever held this doctrine. If he means it as a real presence, we can answer him out of the formularies of the Church. The second homily declares, "This much we must be sure to hold that in the Supper of the LORD, there is no vain ceremony, nor bare sign, no *untrue figure of a thing absent*, but as Scripture saith, the bread and cup of the LORD, the memory of CHRIST, the annunciation of

His death, yea, *the communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord by a marvellous incorporation.*" The words which accompany the delivery of the Sacrament to the people, "The Body of our LORD JESUS CHRIST," "The Blood of our LORD JESUS CHRIST," were restored from the first book at the Elizabethan review. The catechism instructs us that "the Body and Blood of CHRIST are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the LORD's Supper," so that, as the Prayer Book says, "our sinful bodies may be made clean by His Body, and our souls washed through His most precious Blood, and that we may evermore dwell in Him, and He in us." The removal of the words, "real and essential," in the declaration tells most plainly, as we have said before, against Dr. Blakeney's theory.

Again, at p. 405 we read under the head of "No altar:" "The Prayer Book rejects it: (1.) The word altar was expunged; (2.) The rubric as to the position of the table is inconsistent with the notion of an altar." We answer, (1.) In the Coronation service the word altar is still retained. (2.) The 8th Canon of 1640 declares that "the situation of the holy table doth not imply that there is, or ought to be esteemed, a true and proper altar, whereon CHRIST is really again sacrificed, *but it is, and may be called an altar by us in that sense in which the primitive Church called it an altar, and in no other.*"

As Bertram's book is acknowledged to have influenced the mind of Ridley so powerfully as to settle his opinion on the doctrine of the Eucharist, we will quote his words in answer to Dr. Blakeney's inference: "It follows, that if there is no bodily presence and no altar there is no sacrifice of the elements." After quoting from S. Augustine the words, "Was not CHRIST once sacrificed in His own Person? and yet in the Sacrament He is offered up for the people not only during the Paschal solemnity but every day: wherefore he lieth not, who, when questioned, answereth that CHRIST is now sacrificed:" Bertram says, "So we may say, The LORD is sacrificed when the Sacrament of His Passion is celebrated, though He were but once sacrificed in His own Person for the salvation of the world." And again; "Yet it is not false to say that in these mysteries the LORD is sacrificed, or suffers, since they have a likeness to that death and passion, the representations of which they are. Whence they are styled the LORD's Body and the LORD's Blood, for they take the name of those things of which they are the Sacraments. Hence S. Isidore, in his book of Etymologies, speaketh thus: *Sacrificium* is so called from *sacrum factum*, a thing made sacred because it is consecrated by mystical prayer, in remembrance of the LORD's Passion on our behalf."

From our English divines we might answer at great length and produce a catena of authorities who have taught and explained the Eucharistic sacrifice. With two quotations, however, we will be

satisfied. Of the first Dr. Blakeney is not ignorant, as he produces it in another part of his book as an instance of the Romanizing tendency of Bishop Andrewes.

"1. The Eucharist ever was, and by us is considered, both as a Sacrament and a sacrifice. 2. A sacrifice is proper and applicable only to divine worship. 3. The sacrifice of CHRIST's death did succeed to the sacrifices of the Old Testament. 4. The sacrifice of CHRIST's death is available for present, absent, living, dead, (yea, for them that are yet unborn.) 5. When we say the dead, we mean it is available for the Apostles, Martyrs, and Confessors, and all, because we are all members of one body; these no man will deny.

"If we agree about the matter of sacrifice there will be no difference about the altar. The Holy Eucharist being considered as a sacrifice, (in the representation of the breaking of the bread, and pouring forth the cup,) the same is fitly called an altar; which, again, is as fitly called a table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and an application of the sacrifice to the several receivers."—*Andrewes' Minor Works*, p. 10.

The other quotation is from Bishop Sparrow.

"Now that no man take offence at the word *altar* let him know that anciently both these names, *altar* or *holy table*, were used for the same things, though most frequently the fathers and councils use the word *altar*. And both are fit names for that holy thing; for the holy Eucharist, being considered as a sacrifice in the representation of the breaking of the bread and pouring forth the cup, doing to the holy symbols that which was done to CHRIST's Body and Blood, and so showing forth and commemorating the LORD's death and offering upon it the same sacrifice that was offered upon the Cross, or rather the commemoration of that sacrifice, may fitly be called an altar, which again is fitly called a holy table, the Eucharist being considered as a Sacrament, which is nothing else but a distribution and application of the sacrifice to the several receivers."—*Sparrow's Rationale*, p. 304.

Now if the Eucharist be both a sacrifice and a feast upon the sacrifice, altar and holy table are equally applicable to that on which it is celebrated. If at the period of the Reformation the communion view of the Eucharist had been overlooked, and the people had contented themselves with assisting at the sacrifice without partaking of the feast, there may have been some reason for the substitution of the term "holy table" for "altar," without in any way intending to extrude from our services the ideas of sacrifice and altar. The misunderstanding of the double nature of the Eucharist has given rise to two errors, into one of which Dr. Blakeney appears to have fallen.

Respecting vestments we will abstain from saying much, as it is a question which may soon be set at rest by ascertaining the legal state of the case, and we may have to return to it with increased

information when Archdeacon Freeman's book with the Bishop of Exeter's introduction shall appear. It seems to us, however, that the "advertisement" of Elizabeth (which, Archdeacon Churton has reminded us, was never sanctioned by law) and the Canon respecting the surplice were intended to ease the conscience of the Puritans, while the rubric remained the normal law of the Church. It was not intended to abridge, but to enlarge the liberty of the clergy; and therefore, with our present information we maintain the right to use the Eucharistic vestments which were sanctioned by the Acts of Uniformity of 2 Edw. and 1 Eliz., whilst we do not deny to Dr. Blakeney and his party the liberty of laying them aside if they are so inclined.

Concerning the ornaments of the Church, we must protest against Dr. Blakeney's citation, as an authority, of the Bishop of Exeter's judgment in the case of Mr. Parks Smith, since that was withdrawn with the greatest candour and magnanimity in the Bishop's letter to Sir Stephen Lushington.¹

On the Preface to the Ordinal, which sets forth in the strongest manner the necessity of Episcopal ordination, Dr. Blakeney observes:

"Some hold that Episcopal ordination is essential to the ministry, and appeal to this Preface to prove that no one can exercise the ministry without ordination as herein prescribed, and that in the estimation of the Church there have been three orders from 'the Apostles' times.' We answer, the Church of England requires Episcopal ordination in the administration of *her own* ordinances, but in so doing she does not deny the validity of the ordinances of other Churches, though non-Episcopal. Secondly, it does not follow that because there have been three orders in the Church from the Apostles' times, that no ordination is valid unless it be Episcopal."—P. 508.

This statement is supported by the assertion that the Church of England does not insist on the necessity of episcopal ordination, but recognises other Churches as branches of the Catholic Church, which are non-episcopal; and in proof of this Dr. Blakeney appeals to the 55th Canon, which prescribes a bidding prayer in which supplication is to be made, "especially for the Churches of England, *Scotland*, and Ireland." The Church of Scotland is of course taken to be the "Presbyterian Kirk," but when it is considered that at the promulgation of the Canon, although the Scottish titular Bishops were not yet consecrated, King James was

¹ "I will say, that if these matters had been brought to my notice in 1847, had I remembered that Archbishop Parker and Bishop Cox of Ely were disputants in favour of the cross against Grindall and Jewell (Zurich Letters, 1st series, pp. 66, 67; also 2nd series, pp. 41—43;) if, too, I had seen evidence, which has since been given to the world, of crosses being part of the furniture of some parochial churches in the 6th year of Edward VI., *I should have hesitated before I decided that crosses as a Church ornament were not in this Church of England in the 2d year of Edward VI.*"—Bishop of Exeter's Letter to Sir Stephen Lushington, p. 26.

already taking steps for restoring the Apostolic Succession to the Scottish Bishops, which was soon afterwards carried into effect, it can scarcely be a matter of doubt that the Canon referred, not to the Presbyterians, but to the Episcopal Church of Scotland. The admissions of Archbishop Sumner in his unfortunate correspondence with Mr. Gawthorne, and the licence given for the consecration of Bishop Alexander can scarcely be cited as evidence, considering that both were virtually repudiated by a large majority of the English Clergy. It is certain that a Lutheran or a Presbyterian requires ordination before he can be admitted to take part in the ministry of the Church of England, while a Greek or Roman Priest is never reordained on his reconciliation. However, Dr. Blakeney further asserts, that the Church of England since the year 1661 recognises Episcopal ordination in her own ministry, which implies that in 1661 the law of the Church of England underwent a change. This is implied, but not distinctly stated, perhaps, because Dr. Blakeney was aware that the Bishop of Exeter had answered the assertions of Lord Macaulay on this subject. The alteration introduced by the present act was that, whereas before 1661, a person might be instituted to a benefice with cure of souls, being twenty-three years of age and a deacon, but could not retain it unless he should be ordained Priest within a year from his institution, the Act of Uniformity provides that no person not being a Priest by Episcopal ordination shall be capable to be admitted to any ecclesiastical promotion or dignity whatever. This is clear from Lyndwood and from the Act 13 Eliz., c. 12, 13, which enacts that no one hereafter shall be admitted to any benefice with cure of souls except he be of the age of three-and-twenty, and at least a deacon.¹

The presence of Commissioners from England at the Synod of Dort, was no recognition of non-Episcopal ordination. They were sent, not by the Church of England, but by the king, who had political reasons for so doing. We do not justify an act for which the Church is in no way responsible, but it may be well to observe that it is not likely that many of the Doctors of Dort were without Episcopal ordination, as the Seven Provinces had been under Episcopal rule until within a few years of the holding of the synod of Dort; and at the synod Bishop Carleton actually entered a protestation against their proceedings, when in Article XXXI. of the Belgic Confession the parity of all ministers was asserted and the authority of Bishops denied.²

Dr. Blakeney's treatment of the Baptismal service is singular: for he cannot deny the distinct assertion throughout of Baptismal Regeneration, nor does he find fault with the terms in which it is

¹ Correspondence between the Bishop of Exeter and the Right Hon. T. B. Macaulay. Pp. 31, 55.

² Ibid, p. 33.

expressed. What he does is to invent by implication a doctrine for his opponents which they would be the first to disclaim. No one holds that regeneration is all that is needful. Regeneration is not sanctification. The former in a certain sense he would admit, but the latter he denies. He is evidently unaware of the difference between negative and positive sanctification ; the negative sanctification which takes place when the infant, washed from sin, is made a temple of the HOLY GHOST ; and the positive sanctification which results from the continued work of the HOLY GHOST within the soul, corresponding with the will of the baptized, and bringing forth fruits of increased holiness as life advances. The confusion between the two seems to be the cause of all his difficulties, and of some degree of inconsistency too, for it has obliged him to invent two regenerations, of which one is bestowed in Baptism actually and the other hypothetically. The blessings consequent on Baptism, i.e. the inheritance of eternal life and the continuance of God's protection and favour, we all acknowledge to be conditional on our fidelity to our Baptismal vows ; but how we can be taken into a state of actual relation with God hypothetically, we cannot well understand. A man is not hypothetically born his father's eldest son, because this is an actual fact, although the inheritance of his birthright may be conditional on his good behaviour.

We had intended to have examined this Commentary on the Prayer Book more particularly, and had noted down many statements to be answered, but a full reply would fill as bulky a volume as Dr. Blakeney's own. All we can say is, that in our judgment what is new scarcely appeals to common sense, and what is old has been answered again and again before ; yet the show of learning and the ability with which it is written render it a dangerous book to those who have not studied the controversies which have taken place since the Reformation. We trust that no one will be rash enough to accept Dr. Blakeney's statements on his own authority alone, and then it will be useful if it sets men to examine for themselves the originals from which the Prayer Book is derived and the history of the changes which it has undergone. Moreover we are glad of the appearance of this book, because, if it is set forth as the formulary of the evangelical party, we know now with what we have to contend, and have better hope of peace and unity with many whose faith, we believe with Dr. Pusey, is better than their words.

Of Dr. Blakeney himself we have no desire to speak harshly ; his constant mis-spelling of names, as e.g. Burns for Burn, Philpott for Philpotts, Patropassions for Patripassians, evinces a carelessness, which, carried into larger matters, may account for the general inaccuracy of his book, and we see by the letters which he appends to his name that he has not had the advantage of being trained in an English university.

HAVE WE AN ALTAR?

The Ritual Law and Custom of the Church Universal. A Sermon preached at Ludlow Church, on Tuesday, August 29, 1865, before the Ludlow Branch of the English Church Union. By JOHN JEBB, D.D., Rector of Peterstow, and Prebendary and Prælector of Hereford Cathedral. Published by request. London: Rivingtons. 1866.

To the questions, Is there an Altar in the Catholic Church? and Does the Anglican Branch of the Catholic Church recognise the existence of an Altar? and, further, Are the Holy Tables in our churches to be considered as Altars? we should have thought there was but one answer, and that in the language of S. Paul, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle." We should have thought that those who cry out for "the Bible and the Bible only," would be most ready to assert the fact; and were they true to their principles, they would do so. But on the contrary, they are the first to deny the very simple assertion of the inspired Apostle. How then is the difficulty got over? If S. Paul's altar be not that whereon the sacrifice of the Holy Eucharist is offered, what is it? We are told, that the altar means CHRIST; in one sense this is perfectly true, because S. Paul speaks of "partaking of the altar," which, of course, can mean nothing else than partaking of the Body and Blood of CHRIST, as the Jews partook of the sacrifice of the temple; but as the temple had an altar whereon those sacrifices were offered, before they were eaten, so there must be an altar whereon CHRIST is offered before His Body and Blood are partaken of. It is still answered that CHRIST is our altar; that as He is our Priest and our Sacrifice, so He is our Altar too. But who ever heard of such a thing as this? We can quite understand a man being both priest and sacrifice; we can quite understand a man sacrificing himself for the public good—many heathens did this. Moses prayed that he might be made an atonement; S. Paul was willing to be an *anathema* for the salvation of the Jews; but they could not be an altar also; the idea is absurd; besides there is no analogy, or type, or intimation of such in all the Old Testament. It is clearly a desperate theory, a *dernier ressort*, to evade an unpalatable truth. Again, it is said, S. Paul means the "Altar of the Cross," on which our LORD was crucified. This has a far more probable look about it, but it will not stand examination. For, 1st, in the words which follow the crucifixion is likened to those sin-offerings of the Hebrew ritual which were not offered on the altar, they were "burnt without the camp; wherefore Jesus also, that He might sanctify the

people with His own blood, suffered without the gate." Those animals were not offered on any altar, only their blood was brought by the High Priest and offered on the altar in the temple, and sprinkled toward the mercy seat, and over all the vessels of the sanctuary, to purify them. 2ndly; the cross is never styled an altar by any of the ancient Fathers. These two reasons will probably be thought sufficient.

We must, however, enter into a short digression with respect to our last assertion; for, perhaps, some of our readers will call to mind a hymn of S. Bonaventura, "O Ara Crucis," and ask what we have to say to it? Our reply is, that this is the first time that the phrase occurs, that it is poetical, and metaphorical; and lastly, that it is in two points entirely different from patristic language. First in the phrase itself, "the altar of the cross;" and secondly, in the use of the word "Ara." Throughout the LXX. and all the Greek Fathers *βωμὸς* is never used to designate either the altar of the Hebrew temple or those of the Catholic Church, but always *θυσιαστήριον*. The same distinction holds good, in the Vulgate, and the Latin Fathers, between *Altare* and *Ara*; *Ara*, like *βωμὸς*, invariably designates the heathen altars; while *Altare* is as invariably applied to Christian altars, and that of the temple. A striking instance of this occurs in 1 Macc. i. 59, when Antiochus, having set up an idolatrous altar in the temple, sacrificed ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου; in the Vulgate, "super aram, quæ est contra altare." If then S. Bonaventura departed from patristic wording for the sake of his verse, so also did he depart from patristic language for a new idea. These two facts will show how entirely metaphorical his language is, and how little it can be depended on for establishing any doctrinal point, or any interpretation of Scripture. His example, however, has been unfortunately too much followed by later writers.

It may next be said that the altar in the heavenly temple, as seen by S. John, and described in the Apocalypse, is meant. This is coming nearer to the truth; for here we have the antitype of the Hebrew ritual clearly shown. There is here an allusion made to the sin-offering of the red heifer, carried out and burnt without the camp—not on any altar—while the blood is brought into the most holy place for purification; in this we see our LORD as the Great High Priest carrying His own Blood into heaven, and there offering it as the perpetual purification for sins. But this does not come up to S. Paul's description; for no part of the sin-offering was eaten, it was wholly burnt; consequently the faithful could not eat of this sacrifice. S. Paul's words are, "We have an altar, whereof they have no right to eat which serve the tabernacle," implying that those who did not "serve the tabernacle," have an altar of which they have a right to eat. We must then look a little further.

No one will doubt that S. Paul is alluding to the Blessed Eucharist, when he speaks of "eating;" that he referred to our LORD's own words, "Take, eat, this is My Body." How then are we to reconcile this with the idea of CHRIST being the sin-offering, and therefore not to be eaten? We reply that our LORD fulfilled all the sacrifices of the Hebrew ritual, Eucharistic, as well as Expiatory: that not only was His death on the cross the completion of the sin-offering, as we have shown above, but that there was also a fulfilment of that other class of sacrifice, of which, e.g., the Passover was the type; which sacrifices, being Eucharistic, were eaten; and in which the blood was equally offered on the altar, though in a sense, and for a purpose, different from the sin-offering. If we are further asked, When did our LORD offer Himself as the Eucharistic sacrifice? we answer, certainly *not on the Cross*, for that was the sin-offering; but equally certain are we that He did so at the institution of the Holy Eucharist, for then He gave Himself, His own Body and Blood, to be eaten and drunk by the faithful.

Our Eucharists are identical with that of the upper room on Maundy Thursday, for He still gives His Body and Blood to the faithful. Here then we have the true explanation of S. Paul's words, "We have an altar."

We must digress for a moment to point out a mistake made by so many writers at the present day, and we must include the Bishop of Brechin in the number, when they say, that the "sacrifice of the Eucharist is identical with the sacrifice of the Cross;" were it so, the Eucharist could not be eaten, for sin-offerings were never eaten. The mistake arises from not considering that CHRIST fulfilled all the sacrifices of the Hebrew ritual, both Eucharistic and Expiatory, but not at one and the same time. The Eucharistic He instituted when He consecrated Himself in that solemn prayer of Consecration, S. John xvii.; while the sin-offering was completed by His death on the cross.

Another passage, in another Epistle of S. Paul, so strongly bears on the subject, that we cannot pass it over in silence—1 Cor. x. 20, where the antithesis is drawn between the "Table of the LORD" and the "table of demons;" and the "Cup of the LORD" and the "cup of demons." Here the "table of demons" can only mean the βωμὸς of some heathen temple, including the sacrifice offered on it and afterwards eaten. The parallel absolutely requires that if the "table of demons" is a heathen altar, the "Table of the LORD" must be a Christian altar: the argument being, that if any Christian went knowingly to a heathen festival, and sat down to eat of the sacrifices, he then entered into communion with the demon to whom the sacrifice had been offered. So also the eating of the Holy Eucharist is communion with CHRIST, for CHRIST is offered in the Holy Eucharist; consequently, that on which CHRIST is offered is an altar, and therein, parallel to the

heathen, called an altar so far as the sacrifice is concerned, a table so far as communion is implied.

So much for the Scriptural argument. We must now come more nearly to ourselves: have *we* an Altar? Does the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church acknowledge an Altar in our houses of worship? All persons agree in maintaining that the Eastern and Western branches "have an altar;" but there are many who suppose that the Anglican renounced the altar in the sixteenth century, and never again acknowledged one. The grounds on which this opinion is formed are three: 1st, that the word "altar," which remained in the Book of 1549, was changed into "table" in the next and all succeeding editions; 2nd, that altars were actually abolished by Bishop Ridley and tables set up; 3rd, that in the Holy Eucharist, communion being substituted for sacrifice, the altar must have gone too; for an altar without a sacrifice is a mere anomaly.

Before considering these points there is an antecedent question to be answered. Did the primitive Church acknowledge an altar? For if the primitive Church did acknowledge it, then the Anglican Church must do so also, since the principle of the Anglican Reformation was a return to primitive faith and practice. Recognising this principle, we might answer that the ecclesiastical authorities in the sixteenth century *could* not abolish altars, any more than they could abolish the sacrifice, so long as they retained the Liturgy with *Canon Missæ* unimpaired. What they abolished were certain abuses connected inseparably in the minds of the people at that time with the names "altar" and "sacrifice." Had they intended to abolish the altar and the sacrifice, they must have abolished the priesthood also, and, like Protestant sects generally, have established a mere presbyterate. But by their retaining the priesthood and the proper form of consecration, they retained the *thing*, though, because of abuse, they changed the name. Here we may remark, by the way, on the extreme inconsistency of Protestant objectors, who argue, that because the *name* altar was not retained, therefore the *thing* was abolished; while they tell us that though the *name* priest is retained, the priesthood is abolished. For, surely, if the changing of the *name* proves the abolition of the *thing* in the one case, the retention of the *name* in the other implies the retention of the *thing*. This is of some importance, since, if we prove the existence of a priesthood, we must grant the existence of both altar and sacrifice; for a priesthood without an altar and a sacrifice is not only an anomaly, but a contradiction in terms.

But suppose, for the sake of argument, that we admit that altars were abolished in the sixteenth century, and that Ridley's injunctions had the force of law, (which they had not,) is it a fact that they have not been restored at any subsequent time?

The first fact that meets us is, that there has continued an office in use whenever occasion required, in which the word "altar" is retained—the Coronation Office. Now if, at the coronation of the Sovereign, the holy table in Westminster Abbey is called an "altar," it must be such at other times also; and if in Westminster, then in every cathedral and parish church throughout England.

From this we may perceive the true state of the case: the word altar was changed into holy table at the second revision of the Liturgy, partly because of certain abuses, and partly to bring out more strongly the practice of regular communion, which had fallen into disuse. On account of strong Puritanical prejudice the *name* was not re-introduced at subsequent revisions, but the *thing* was retained whenever it could be done with safety: for instance, in the Chapels Royal and private chapels, with all its proper furniture and ministrations. In one office, however, where it was not likely to give popular offence, the name was retained: this shows the intention of the revisionists.

The same policy was kept up in the first half of the seventeenth century: the *thing* was restored wherever it could be done. Laud, when Dean of Gloucester, set the holy table altarwise in the cathedral: his example was followed in other places; the Dean and Chapter of Durham set up a stone altar in the cathedral, which still remains. The work was done cautiously, and by degrees; the standing at the north side, or in the midst, were apparently not insisted upon. In the case of the Scottish Liturgy it was left optional to stand at the north side or at the north end; unnecessary offence was carefully avoided. One attempt was made to re-introduce the name, viz., in the Canons of 1640. The like may be said with regard to vestments: where they could be worn without offence, they were worn. At Coronations and State occasions they were prescribed. In other places, as at Durham, where, apparently, the use of them caused no offence, they were continued; but all that was really contended for was the use of the surplice, and the abolishing of the Genevan gown. The real struggle was not, as now, between surplice and chasuble at celebration, but between surplice and gown; for it was with great difficulty that the former could maintain its place. Hence the visitation questions, on which so much is now said, were only as to the use of the surplice. It would have been mere mockery to inquire about albs and chasubles, when the surplice was with difficulty retained. Even that went, together with priesthood, altar, vestments, liturgy, and all the marks of Catholic worship, in the Great Rebellion.

Then followed the Restoration. A revision was made; the revisionists were men who had suffered in the Rebellion; they knew the temper of the people, and acted accordingly. They restored what they could without giving offence. They saw the Prayer

Book and the surplice generally acquiesced in, together with a certain amount of decent ritual; they were not going to endanger this by trying to do more. One thing, however, they did—it was of more importance than all others: they restored the holy table to its place as the altar; instead of being dragged into the body of the church and there profaned, it was set up at the east end of the chancel, fenced in by rails, and vested. Chancel stalls and chancel screens were also restored in great numbers of churches. Here, once more, the *thing* was maintained; and the wise revisionists would not risk the existence of the *thing* by changing its *name*.

But while they followed this cautious policy for their own generation, they were careful to provide for the future: they were not going to leave their successors destitute of the means of restoring that full measure of Catholic worship, which was impossible in their time. They hoped and they prayed that the time would come when the priesthood and the laity would not only tolerate, but actually provide, those adjuncts of Catholic worship which had ever been in use in the Church. Hence they revised the Rubric, so as to include altar, vestments, lights, &c. The time that they looked forward to is now come; and we are now privileged to carry out those reforms, which the revisers of 1662 would have carried out in their day had circumstances allowed them.

The reform begun by Laud, and carried out by the revisers of 1662, eventuated in a more definite establishment of the altar question. In the earlier stages of the Reformation movement, it was the custom—and this custom was commonly followed by the Puritans—to remove the altar from its proper place, and set it in the body of the building, for the convenience of communicants; and this custom received a sanction from the Canons of 1603, as may be seen from Canon LXXXII.: thus practically turning the altar into a mere table. It may well be questioned whether this custom, and the canon which sanctioned it, ever had really the force of law, since the rubric at the commencement of matins stood thus:—"And the chancels shall remain as in times past." Besides this, the Act of Henry VIII. c. 19 confirmed all the ancient canons of the English Provincial Councils, and even gave them the force of law, with the only exception of such as were contrariant to the law of the land. But, however this may be,—it is not worth while to discuss the point,—the introduction of the rubric on ornaments entirely nullified the Puritan innovation, superseded the Canon of 1603 and all Royal and Episcopal Injunctions, as far as this matter is concerned, and brought back the older order; and this fact receives abundant proof in practice at this present day. It is now the settled law that no altar can be removed without a faculty from the Bishop; and further, which often happens in our day of church restoration, when the site of the altar is changed, e.g., when the chancel of a church is extended, and the altar re-

moved eastward of its old place, there must be a reconsecration of the chancel ; while, on the other hand, it is held to be law, that no reconsecration is necessary in the case of a restoration of a church, provided that the site of the altar is not moved, even though the whole building is re-edified. And this principle is acknowledged and recognised by Parliament in the Church Building Acts so universally, that if a marriage be celebrated in an old parish church whose altar has been thus removed, but which has not been reconsecrated, it is more than doubtful if it be valid. And this, be it remembered, is peculiar to the altar ; it is not so with pulpit, reading desk, or even the font : proving very clearly the peculiar sanctity of the altar, and its essential importance sacramentally. In other words, it proves that our altars are altars.

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

(Continued from p. 144.)

(3.) THE teaching of S. Paul on the unity of the Church is the next subject for our consideration. The Apostle not only says that there is "one Spirit," but also "one Body," (Eph. iv. 4,) and that the Church is CHRIST's Body, "the fulness of Him that filleth all in all." (Eph. i. 23.) Now here we may especially see *the* difference between the teaching of S. Paul and that of so-called Protestantism. S. Paul teaches, as we have said, that there is one Spirit and one Body ; the modern school alluded to maintains that there is one Spirit, but *not* also one Body. In other words, S. Paul condemns the theory of an invisible Church, as it is called, or the opinions of those who deny that a Church organization is essential, as being of Apostolic or Divine institution ; thinking that the members of the Catholic Church are they who are spiritually united to CHRIST, whatever be the outward form of Church discipline under which they live, or the denomination, as it is called, to which they belong. Now we are not denying that men may be united to CHRIST by a true and living faith, even when separated from His Body the Church ; but such cases are exceptional, are not GOD's ordinary rule, nor do they imply that a certain form of Church government is not essential, according to His ordinary law. If the theory before us be true, there neither is, nor can be, one Body, if this word have any meaning or appropriateness whatever. Besides, that "one Body" is to be understood, and was understood by S. Paul, in its ordinary sense, is manifest from the Apostle's reasoning in another chapter. (1 Cor. xii. 11—27.)

According to the theory we are examining, S. Paul ought to have said, "There is one Spirit," and then have stopped: his adding that there is one Body is both superfluous and untrue.

Again, the theory of an invisible Church is condemned by the teaching of the Apostle that there is (4) one Faith; by which term, as we have already proved, the Apostle means a certain dogmatic system, as it may be called, and not a mere agreement, as is supposed, upon a few fundamental doctrines. Besides, the Apostle holds the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession and also of Sacramental Grace. (5.) When S. Paul was about "to be offered, and the time of his departure was at hand," he appointed Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, bidding him keep that which was committed to his trust—the deposit of Apostolic faith and doctrine—avoiding profane and vain babblings and oppositions of science, falsely so called, which some professing have erred concerning the faith (1 Tim. vi. 20, 21;) and afterwards the Apostle says, "The things which thou hast heard of me, the same commit thou to faithful men who shall be able to teach others also." (2 Tim. ii. 2.) To the care of Timothy was thus committed the Apostolic faith and doctrine; and the gift which he received for the due discharge of his high and holy office was bestowed upon him by imposition of hands. "I put thee in remembrance to stir up the gift of God which is in thee by the putting on of my hands." (2 Tim. i. 6; also verse 14.)

The Apostle here teaches the doctrine of Sacramental Grace, or that grace is given through outward rites and ordinances;¹ a doctrine implied, or rather clearly brought before us, in the Ordination Service of the Church of England.² Thus the teaching of S. Paul is wholly opposed to the statement of Foxe, and of others who agree with his opinions in the present day, that grace is *only* given *through* faith, and not *through* sacramental signs or forms. Besides, if grace be given through faith only—either with or without sacramental signs or forms—the Sacraments could not be, as the Church believes, "necessary for salvation;" nay, they would be of no benefit whatever, except as signs and memorials of grace, useful to stir up pious and devout feelings. Faith is undoubtedly needed for a beneficial reception of sacramental ordinances, since without it we cannot be profited by them; but gifts of grace are *really* annexed to sacramental rites, which are the channels for their conveyance to the soul. Now let us observe, in a few words, the Apostle's condemnation of the popular anti-sacramentarian theory.

¹ See also Acts xix. 6: "When Paul had laid his hands upon them, the HOLY GHOST came on them."

² "Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a Bishop in the Church of God, now committed unto thee by the imposition of our hands. . . . And remember that thou stir up the grace of God which is given thee by this imposition of our hands."

He tells us that there is one Body or Church, thus excluding schismatics, or those separated from the Church, from the appointed means of grace and salvation. He teaches, moreover, that there is "one Faith"—a definite creed or form of belief; and how *can this be preserved*, except in the "one Church," and by the Apostolic succession, which was appointed not only for the transmission of Apostolic orders, but also of that one faith of which the Church is the appointed guardian and keeper? The one Church, the Apostolic Succession, and the one Faith, ever have been, and only can be, inseparably connected together; nor can we doubt the identity on these essential doctrines of the teaching of S. Paul and of the Catholic Church. The three branches of the Church, Roman, Anglican, and Eastern, are now indeed divided from each other: the Church Catholic is in an abnormal state. But the estrangement which exists—we will not use the word schism as respects either the Roman or the Anglican Church—has been partly owing to political causes, and partly also to non-essential points of doctrine, so that the one faith is still held by the separated portions of the Church, is held without *essential* change or variation, throughout the universal Body; and the present unhappy non-communication of members of the Church is, through God's blessing, approaching, we trust, its termination. The prayer of our dying Redeemer for His disciples will then be realised, and there shall be one fold and one Shepherd.

In regard to our next subject of Tradition, (6,) we may first remark, that S. Paul by the word not only refers to matters of discipline (which is unquestionable,) but *also* to matters of doctrine, as is evident from such passages as 1 Cor. xi. 2, and 2 Thess. iii. 15, as is admitted by Bishop Ellicot.¹ Besides, in many cases it would not be possible to separate matters of doctrine and discipline, as they have a necessary connection with each other. Thus infant Communion was a general usage or tradition of the primitive Church, which some writers have believed was of Apostolic origin; now this usage manifestly involves a very important doctrine, viz., that the efficacy of sacramental grace does not depend upon the faith of the receiver, since the Church by this usage evidently shows her belief that grace may be imparted to an unconscious infant. Speaking on this subject, it may be remarked that our Church has greatly suffered from undervaluing the importance of tradition. It cannot be doubted, as Dr. Pusey and others have observed, that the disbelief too generally prevailing in our Church, especially amongst the poor, on the doctrine of Baptismal Grace, has been owing, partly at least, to discontinuing the customary

¹ "We are not deterred by the known use of the text in support of tradition from stating the opinion, that, in the case of 2 Thess. ii. 15, the use of *ἐδιδάχθητε*, and the general tenour of the context, justify the reference of *παράδοσις* to matters not only of discipline, but *also* of doctrine."—Aids to Faith, p. 424.

usages of the Church in the administration of the Sacrament, as the exsufflations, the white vestment, the anointing-usages of primitive and perhaps Apostolic origin, which bore witness to the doctrine of the Church on Holy Baptism, and were most powerful means of impressing it upon the minds of the faithful. But there is another view of this subject of especial importance at the present day, which must be brought under the notice of our readers. The doctrines of our Church on many important subjects have not been clearly and authoritatively defined. The Church merely appeals to patristic teaching as her standard of doctrine—the belief and tradition of Catholic antiquity. Thus in the well-known Canon of 1571 preachers are required to teach, as being really of faith, what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old and New Testament, and what has been gathered from it by Catholic Bishops and Fathers.¹ In the Homilies, also, the teaching of the Fathers is continually referred to, and quoted as the standard of Anglican theology. Let us turn over a few pages. In “the first part of the Sermon of Holy Scripture,” we read, “And as the great clerk and godly preacher S. John Chrysostom saith, whatsoever is required to salvation of man is fully contained in the Scripture of God. . . . There is, saith S. Fulgentius, enough both for men to eat and children to suck.” And in the “second part,” S. Chrysostom and S. Augustine are both appealed to in proof of important doctrine. Such is Church-of-Englandism; we appeal, as the standard of our faith, to the Fathers, to the doctrine and tradition of the early Church. And yet certain writers of the present day frequently attempt to impose upon their readers what *they* term Anglican views of doctrine. They select a writer with whose opinions they agree as the representative of Anglicanism; and should any one venture to dissent from their model writer, he is accused of unsound teaching. Thus Mr. Goode, the Dean of Ripon, in his controversy a few years ago with Mr. Oakeley,² quotes Dean Aldrich, whose statement of the doctrine of the Church on the Holy Eucharist is “so judicious,” as Dean Goode thinks, that it is quoted *in extenso*: we have no intention to follow Mr. Goode’s example by transcribing four closely-printed octavo pages, containing the *opinions* of the writer referred to, which of course are of no value or authority whatever. The subject has been alluded to in order that we may have the opportunity of protesting against so-called Anglican theories of doctrine, as if they were of binding authority upon the writers or members of our Church, which, as we have already shown, is contrary to the teaching of the Church of England. We

¹ *Concionatores*. “Imprimis vero videbunt, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ veteris aut novi Testamenti quodque ex illa ipsa doctrina catholici patres et veteres Episcopi collegerint.”

² Tract XC. Historically Refuted: a Reply to Oakeley, by W. Goode. 1845.

may also add that the theory before us for another reason is manifestly untenable. The doctrine of the Holy Eucharist has been referred to: now where shall we find, amongst eminent and learned writers of our Church, the *authoritative* Anglican theory on this doctrine? On the contrary, we meet with discordant opinions—various schools of doctrine—even in the works of our standard authors. Bishop Taylor, e.g., teaches that in the Holy Eucharist CHRIST is present by grace and blessing, which is undoubtedly true, but surely a very incomplete and imperfect statement, or rather an untrue statement; since Taylor adds, that our LORD is not present in His human nature, and thus, as the Divine and human natures of CHRIST are inseparably joined at the Incarnation, it follows that our LORD is not really present in any true sense of the words in the Sacrament.¹ Compare Bishop Taylor's theory with that of Bishop Cosin, in his history of Transubstantiation. Bishop Cosin says: "Now it is said that the Body and Blood of CHRIST are joined to the bread and wine, because that in the celebration of the Holy Eucharist the Flesh is given together with the bread, and the Blood together with the wine."² Bishop Taylor's teaching is inconsistent with CHRIST's objective presence in the Sacrament—a doctrine which Cosin, and it may be added Andrewes, Laud, and Bramhall, undoubtedly believed.

Again, Waterland denies the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice, or rather asserts that the Fathers taught only a figurative sacrifice, as of alms, or of a contrite heart;³ but Bramhall asserts, that we have no difference with the Church of Rome on the doctrine of the Sacrifice.⁴ It shall only be added, that we have no intention to speak in terms of disparagement of writers, to some of whom not the Church of England only, but Christendom itself is indebted; but a protest was needed against the theory of certain modern authorities, which is not only contradictory, as we have seen, to the teaching of the Church of England, but would have been indignantly repudiated by our standard divines, to whom allusion has been made.

(7.) S. Paul teaches in the seventh chapter of 1 Corinthians,

¹ "We may not render Divine worship to Him, i.e. CHRIST, (as present in the Blessed Sacrament according to His human nature,) without danger of idolatry; because He is not there according to His human nature, and therefore you give Divine worship to a *non ens*, which must be idolatry. For *idolum nihil est in mundo*, saith S. Paul; and CHRIST as present by His human nature in the Sacrament is a *non ens*; for it is not true—there is no such thing. He is present there by His Divine power and His Divine blessing, and the fruits of His Body, the real effective consequents of His Passion; but for any other presence it is *idolum*—it is nothing in the world. Adore CHRIST in heaven, for the heavens must receive Him till the time of restitution of all things," &c.—The Third Letter to one tempted to the Romish Church. Polemical Discourses, ed. 1674.

² Cosin's Works, vol. iv. p. 170, (Anglo-Cath. ed.)

³ The Eucharist considered in a sacrificial view. Vol. iv. Oxf. 1856.

⁴ Vol. ii. p. 276, (Anglo-Cath. ed.)

that celibacy is a higher state than that of marriage, as is obvious from the ordinary meaning of his language. He says that he would have all men like himself, i.e., unmarried, though, as he says, each man has his proper gift of God: and in his comparison between the married and unmarried state, the same teaching is abundantly clear. He says, "she that is married careth for the things of the world, that she may please her husband: she that is unmarried careth for the things of the LORD, that she may be holy both in body and soul;" which can only mean, according to Bishop Fell's Commentary,¹ "that there seems to be a higher degree of holiness in abstaining from lawful pleasures as those of marriage." S. Paul's teaching, that the single state is superior to that of married life, has been attributed to his remark on the "present distress." That is, he is supposed to say, that a single state was *then* preferable on account of the persecution which Christians endured; but his words go far beyond "a *present* distress," even if by that expression present sufferings and persecutions should be referred to, which is very doubtful—as the commentator just quoted has observed—since the Apostle is more probably referring by the "present distress," to the shortness and uncertainty of our present state upon earth, as in vers. 29—31. S. Paul's teaching is unquestionably in accordance with that of the early Church. He tells us virginity is a higher state than marriage, and ought rather to be chosen by all who have the proper gift. In S. Paul's last journey to Jerusalem, he saw the four daughters of S. Philip the Evangelist, "who were virgins," i.e., had made a profession of virginity. Had the Evangelist's daughters been merely unmarried women, to record the fact would have been superfluous and unmeaning. Besides there is other evidence that there were professed virgins in the Apostolic age as in the Epistles of S. Ignatius, where, whilst the higher state of continence is plainly indicated, virgins are warned against boasting and pride.² S. Justin also mentions some who had persevered in a celibate state for sixty or seventy years, that is from the Apostolic age.³ Now this doctrine of S. Paul ought especially to be considered in the present state of our Church; since too generally amongst ourselves the celibate state is treated with obloquy and slander. Nor can it be doubted that our prejudice on this subject will greatly

¹ See on 1 Cor. vii. Bishop Fell refers in a note to the striking passage in the Apocalypse, xiv. 4, μετὰ γυναικῶν οὐκ ἐμολύνθησαν.

² Εἴ τις δύναται ἐν ἀγγελίᾳ μένειν εἰς τιμὴν τοῦ Κυρίου τῆς σαρκὸς ἐν ἀκαυχῆσί μιν. Ad Polycarpum, § 5. And in another Epistle (ad Smyrναῖος, § 13,) the virgins are saluted, "The virgins who are called widows," (τὰς παρθένους τὰς λεγόμενας χήρας.) By widows is meant deaconesses, as widows were generally chosen for their office; though sometimes, as was the case in the present instance, deaconesses had been selected from the virgins. It is indeed evident, that in no other sense could virgins be called widows.

³ Apol. i. § 15.

impede the all-important duty of the union of Christendom. Straws, as we know, show the direction of the wind. A well-known modern commentator has even ventured upon the monstrous assertion, that the unmarried are burying their talent in the earth, and can only expect at last the doom of unprofitable servants!

(8.) Again S. Paul tells us, that he was "in fastings often," that he "kept under his body, and brought it into subjection, lest after having preached to others, himself should be a castaway," (1 Corinth. ix. 27,) seeming to imply that he used other austerities besides fasting which were of a severe nature, as is implied according to the obvious meaning of the term which the Apostle uses, *ὑποτάσσω*. And Timothy, whom S. Paul called "his own son in the faith," and who therefore we may suppose was one who obeyed his instructions, and imitated his example, is admonished by the Apostle to restrain all excessive austerities, "Drink no longer water, but use a little wine, for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities." Our usual inattention to this duty in the English Church, is, alas! too notorious to require proof. Though fasting or abstinence is ordered by the Church on certain days, yet this duty is generally disregarded by the Clergy; and it cannot be doubted that the neglect of it, even by respectable and religious members of our Church when travelling on the Continent, has led with other causes to a general impression amongst foreign churches, that we are not merely uncatholic in our habits, which is too manifest, but are in reality a mere Protestant sect.

(9.) S. Paul's teaching on Bigamy, or the second marriages of the Clergy, shall now be considered. He says, in his Epistle to Timothy, that the Bishop, Presbyter,¹ or Deacon must be the husband of one wife. Of the Apostle's meaning there can be no doubt, either from his words, according to their ordinary meaning, or from the usage of the Catholic Church, which, grounding her teaching on the Apostolic injunction, has always forbidden the second marriage of the clergy, as in the Apostolical Canons.² Besides, it would be easy to prove that the Apostle's words must necessarily be understood in the sense already given. Two interpretations only are possible: (1,) that the Apostle forbids a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon to have two wives at the same time (polygamia simultanea;) or, (2,) to have two wives successively; i. e., to marry again after the death of a first wife, (polygamia successiva.) Now the first interpretation is manifestly untenable. During the Apostolic age we assert that no Christian or baptized person was allowed to

¹ Whether S. Paul by the word "bishop" referred to the officer in the Church at present so-called, or to a presbyter, has been disputed, though we believe the latter is meant. However, it seems clear that, if a second marriage would render a man ineligible for the lowest sacerdotal rank, *à fortiori* would it render him unfit for the higher offices of bishop and priest.

² "He who has been twice married after Baptism . . . cannot become a bishop, presbyter, or deacon, or any other of the sacerdotal list."—Canon XVIII.

have two wives at the same time: polygamy did not exist *in the Church*, if we may judge from Scripture,¹ or early ecclesiastical history. We may also feel assured that, when Timothy was enjoined to choose Bishop, Priest, or Deacon, he would only select them from the baptized members of the Church, and not from the unbaptized heathen. Now, if these officers were chosen from the Christian body, and polygamy did not exist in the Church, it was impossible that S. Paul could mean, by the Bishop or Priest being the husband of one wife, that he was not to have two wives at the same time, because polygamists did not exist in the Church at all, and therefore could not possibly have been chosen. Thus it must necessarily follow that the second interpretation proposed of the Apostle's words can only be maintained. Such, as already intimated, was the belief and interpretation of the Church in early ages, and her teaching at the present day is the same. In the Eastern Church if a Priest re-marries, he is compelled to retire into lay communion.² The Western Church has sometimes given dispensations, as in the case of recent converts from the Church of England. We shall leave this subject, without further remark, to the serious consideration of some amongst our clergy who have contracted a second, or even a third marriage!³

¹ See especially 1 Cor. vii. 2, 3, 4, 10, 11, 13, 14, 27, 39. How clearly and repeatedly the Apostle here alludes to the *one* wife of the Christian believer, which was no doubt urgently needed in addressing Grecian converts, who before baptism had mostly lived in polygamy.

² Dr. Neale says, "The custom in Russia is as follows: a parish priest must necessarily be married before his ordination; if he loses his wife, the almost universal custom is that he enters a monastery. Rare cases have occurred in which he has been permitted to retain his cure. But if he professes himself incapable of a celibate life, he may marry again; only in that case he gives up every function of the priesthood."—Voices from the East, p. 58, (Masters.)

³ The patristic interpretation of 1 Tim. iii. 2 is thus given by a modern Commentator. Let the meaning be remembered of "*polygamia simultanea*" and "*successiva*." In refuting the opinion that the Apostle, by the husband of one wife, referred to "*polygamia simultanea*," he goes on: "*Hæc enim polygamia apud Christianos nunquam fuit licita; apud Judæos erat tunc abrogata; apud Gentiles erat Romanis legibus prohibita: ad quid ergo specialiter a D. Paulo prohiberetur episcopis? . . . Inter antiquos solus Theodoretus approbat hanc opinionem, dicentem his verbis prohiberi polygamiam simultaneam, seu prohiberi ne in episcopum eligatur qui plures simul habuerit uxores. Omnes vero sancti Patres senserunt vetari polygamiam successivam, seu ne in episcopum eligendus qui plures habuerit uxores licet successive videantur. (Apud Bellar. lib. i. de Cler. c. 23, 24.) Itaque sensus est: sit unus uxoris vir; non sit bigamus, secundas nuptias etiam successive non inierit: unus tantum fuerit matrimonii; aut sit agamus aut monogamus. Ita intelligendum esse hunc locum docet traditio et antiquissimus ecclesiæ usus, bigamos non ordinandos. Audiat de hac re Tertullianus: 'Quantum detrahant fidei, quantum obstrepant sanctitati nuptiæ secundæ disciplina Ecclesiæ et præscriptio Apostoli declarat, cum bigamos non sinit præsidere, cum viduam allegi in ordinem nisi univiram non concedit.' Ad Uxorem (lib. i. c. vii.) et in Exhortatione castitatis citatus a Grotio. Sed præterea hunc esse D. Pauli sensum patet ex altero loco (c. v. 9) ubi de femina eligenda in viduarum ordinem ait, *Vidua eligatur . . . quæ fuerit unus viri uxor*; seu quæ unum virum habuerit; ne successive quidem duos: nec enim femina licuit unquam duos simul viros habere."—Piconio, Epist. S. Pauli triplex Expositio in loc. (Vesont. 1857.)*

(10.) Another doctrine of S. Paul, peculiar to this Apostle, is his teaching on the Judgment-day purgation. He says, "The fire shall try every man's work of what sort it is. If any man's work shall abide which he hath built thereupon, he shall receive a reward; if any man's work shall be burned, he shall suffer loss; but he himself shall be saved, yet so as by fire." (1 Cor. iii. 14, 15.) The early Fathers almost universally interpreted this passage of a Judgment-day purgatory, through which, as they believed, all must pass; the righteous suffering in proportion to the imperfections and sins of the present life, and the wicked falling into the everlasting fire. This doctrine of S. Paul may perhaps illustrate the very difficult question, how God will deal with the great number of imperfect and sinful Christians who leave this world in a state unfit for the Divine Presence:—may they not be saved, after enduring the punishment which their offences merit, so as by fire?

(11.) Another subject remains—the teaching of S. Paul on the Second Coming of CHRIST, in illustrating which a few remarks will be needed on the figurative language of Holy Scripture. The Apostle says, in the Epistle to the Corinthians, that "the trumpet shall sound and the dead shall be raised;" and in another Epistle (1 Thess. iv. 16) that "the LORD shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and the trump of God." The word in the original is *ἐν κελύσματι*, with a battle-shout; we know not what is meant by this word, or by the voice of the archangel or the trumpet of God. The expressions are not, we may suppose, to be literally understood: we have here a forcible intimation that the end of the world and CHRIST's coming to judge all mankind will be ushered in by signs so striking and terrible, that they are most fitly expressed by such illustrations as the battle-shout, the archangel's voice, the trumpet of God. S. Paul elsewhere seems at least to assert that the faithful Christians will not be judged, but caught up when their LORD appears, to meet Him in the clouds, and so, as He says, shall be ever with the LORD; whereas we are told by our Blessed LORD that all mankind, both the righteous and the wicked, shall be gathered together before His judgment-seat, when the wicked shall be sentenced to punishment, and eternal rewards bestowed upon the righteous. Our LORD's words, probably, are not to be understood *literally*, as if the whole human race were to be gathered in one place, and divided into two portions. The account may be intended to teach, in figurative language, what are the virtues of God's faithful people, which He especially approves of and will reward, and the vices of the wicked, which especially call down His indignation upon them. Our LORD's description seems also to intimate that the judgment of all mankind (how, we know not) will be public, and visible to the whole world. We can only reconcile S. Paul's teaching with that of our LORD by supposing that the Apostle regards the judgment of the righteous, not

as being a judgment properly so called, as if it were doubtful beforehand whether they would be rewarded or punished, but rather as a public declaration of their acceptableness in the sight of their GOD and SAVIOUR. Hence S. Paul passes by the Judgment day unnoticed, (it was, if we may so speak, in their case a mere formality,) when recording the triumphant joy with which the righteous will behold their Judge, knowing assuredly that *the* shall be for ever with the LORD.

But in asserting the fact that there is much figurative language in Holy Scripture, often misunderstood according to the mere letter, it must be remembered that spiritual and divine things could not otherwise *in any degree* have been made intelligible to man's comprehension; and also that the existence of figurative language is not inconsistent with certain positive facts and statements which can only be understood in their usual and obvious sense. There is undoubtedly a day or time of judgment, when CHRIST will be visibly manifested to the world, but in what way, and under what circumstances we know not; and although the fact itself be certain, we are also equally ignorant in what manner a man shall at last be judged according to their works.

(*To be continued.*)

NEWMAN'S REPLY TO PUSEY'S EIRENICON.

A Letter to the Rev. E. B. Pusey, D.D., on his recent Eirenicon
By JOHN HENRY NEWMAN, D.D., of the Oratory. London
Longman and Co., Paternoster Row. 1866.

(*Concluded from page 134.*)

It must be remarked, even by the most casual reader, that Dr. Newman in his letter has brought forward only *three* out of the *fifty* well-known and most noted of the Ante-Nicene Fathers; that one of these three witnesses was without the pale of the Catholic Church at the time that his testimony was given, and that his statement that "CHRIST was the Man alone without sin, because CHRIST was God," places the Blessed Virgin both under the curse and the penalty of original sin; that a second of these witnesses asserts the entire condemnation of our race, and by the constructions in which he expresses the relation in which Mary stands to the first woman, gives evidence directly in the teeth of Dr. Newman's conclusions; while the third, although allowing her higher prerogatives than either of the other two writers, actually charges her with the venial sin of "unseasonable haste" in regard to the miracle of

her Divine Son at Cana of Galilee. All the Ante-Nicene fathers unfold the scheme of grace, some with greater, others with less fullness and distinctness; but *none* of them fail to hold up Adam as the head of the fallen, and CHRIST as the head of the new and regenerate race. If Mary played that important part in the economy of redemption which the Roman Catholic writers would claim for her, she would have been mentioned in *all* the Ante-Nicene writers as CHRIST is mentioned in them, and she would have been by them in some way associated with the *Sacraments* of the Church. Her name would have been introduced into the Baptismal formula; her presence would have been recognised in the Blessed Eucharist. It is a most significant fact that, in comparatively recent times, an attempt has been made, and as strongly insisted against, to introduce the flesh of Mary with the Flesh of CHRIST in the consecrated elements.

The Ante-Nicene evidence upon which Dr. Newman would build his grand superstructure is really hardly more than a shadow,¹ a secondary type; and when the type is allowed to the full, but little is gained from it, so that we wonder while we read these words:—"No one who acknowledges the force of early testimony in determining Christian truth, can wonder, no one can complain, can object, that we Catholics should hold a very high doctrine concerning the Blessed Virgin, unless, indeed, stronger statements can be brought for a contrary opinion of her, either of as early, or at least of a later date. But, as far as I know, no statements can be brought from the Ante-Nicene literature to invalidate the testimony of the three Fathers concerning her." (P. 41.) This assumption is almost beyond belief: it quietly, without evidence, supposes itself to have obtained all that it can desire, and then turns round and asks, vauntingly, who can contradict it? The testimony of "the three Fathers" is most clear as to the Virgin falling under all the conditions of the creature, which is now subjected to vanity; there is not a tittle of testimony as to her being in a supposed state of grace from her birth. There really is nothing to answer on this point; yet, for the sake of putting the matter on a still stronger footing, we will examine "three Fathers" of the Ante-Nicene period upon their teaching of the Virgin—S. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and S. Cyprian. The sequel will show whether they do or do not run wholly counter to Dr. Newman's assumed propositions as to the teaching of SS. Justin, Irenæus, and Tertullian.

The metaphysical examination of the more subtle points of theology was a marked characteristic of S. Clement of Alexandria, and of the other fathers of the Alexandrian school. The *Stromata*

¹ "There is a fitness in the Redeemer being born of a woman as the first man was deceived by a woman; but these 'congruities' are 'a kind of pictures' that may be offered for the persuasion of unbelievers, not the ground of any solid theory."—Oxenham on the Atonement.

abound with allusions to the fall of man, to original sin, to the work and office of salvation, to the means by which is effected man's restoration to God's favour, as well as to His image and likeness. The Blessed Virgin is regarded by S. Clement in no other light than as the human Mother of our Blessed LORD: beyond this fact we never find her name mentioned as being an integral and lasting element in the scheme of grace. This is the more remarkable because S. Clement acknowledges and upholds her perpetual virginity, making a statement the exact contrary to that of Tertullian, which has been quoted (p. 132;) who affirmed that Mary lost her virginity by parturition. S. Clement says that "to many in these days it seems as if Mary was regarded as a woman in childbed (λεχών) on account of the birth of the Child; not being a woman in childbed, for some say that, being obstetrically examined after parturition, she was found to be a Virgin," (Strom. vii. 16:) a circumstance which seems to have been founded upon a more lengthy account of the matter which is given in the Apocryphal Gospel, the Protevangel of S. James. It is curious how definitely S. Clement should have contradicted Tertullian. Elsewhere CHRIST is spoken of as "the Fruit of a Virgin;" but the passage which we have given is the only one in which the Blessed Virgin is spoken of by name. As to the notion of Mary being "the second Eve," we may venture to assert that such a thought found no acceptance with S. Clement; for he could hardly have failed to refer to it under the following circumstances. He is treating of original sin, and is asking, How can they who have not committed any actual sin fall under the Adamitic curse? "It remains for them, as it seems, to say, consequently, that the generation was evil, not alone that which is of the body, but also that which is of the mind, for whose sake the body was given. And when David says, 'Behold, I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin did my mother conceive me,' (Ps. li. 5,) he speaks prophetically indeed of the mother Eve. But Eve was 'the mother of all living;' and if he had been conceived in sin, he was not himself (actually) in sin, nor really himself (actual) sin. But if any one from sin is converted to the faith, he turns to life from the habit of the sinner, as if from a mother." (Strom. iii. § 16.) Original sin is derived from our descent through Eve; not a word is said about our restoration through her who was born of his seed, and who is called by some the second and life-giving Eve.

Again, Adam is regarded as the first head of our race, and not Eve; and although S. Clement thinks that he was not created perfect, but only with the elements of perfection in him in germ (Strom. vi. § 8,) he asks, "What did this nobility of birth (εὐγένεια) profit Adam? But he had no mortal father, but he himself by generation became the father of men; but things which were base he readily chose, following after his wife, but he was careless about the things which were true and beautiful: for which causes he exchanged an immortal for a mortal life." (Strom. ii. § 19.) In this

passage it is Adam, and not Eve, who is spoken of as the beginning of death to our race. The sentence concludes with "but not for ever;" some commentators referring these words to Adam's subsequent repentance, the true meaning doubtless being that CHRIST would come at the last day, and for ever make an end of death.

Lastly, the work of CHRIST is often mentioned by S. Clement, the work of Mary never. It is in the "Protrepticon," however, that we have the most glowing descriptions of our Blessed LORD's work, to the exclusion of the Virgin. Surely, if Mary was to be put in parallel with Eve, we should find mention of her name in the following passage:—"For there is one, the deceiver truly, who led away Eve, but now indeed, the other men to death; and One, the LORD Himself, our Patron and Help, from the beginning prophetically pre-signified, but now indeed manifestly exhorting men to repentance." (Prot. § 1.) The first *αἷς* referring to Eve, the second *αἷς*, on Dr. Newman's hypothesis, ought surely to refer to Mary, and not to CHRIST. A little further on in the same treatise we find CHRIST spoken of as "the door" which we ought to search out, if we wish to know God, that He may open to us all at once the gates of heaven. "I know full well that He Who now opens the closed door will afterwards reveal those things which are within, and will show those things which were not able to be known before, except from those who had walked with CHRIST, of Whom alone is God to be discerned." (Id.) The Litany of the Blessed Virgin Mary which is now sung at Benediction in the Roman churches differs considerably in its teaching from the doctrine of the New Testament and S. Clement, for it addresses Mary as "Janua Cœli," and as "Auxilium Christianorum;" against which must be placed S. Clement's words, *ὁ Κύριος βοηθὸς ἡμῶν*. There are passages of surpassing beauty upon our LORD as the "Light of the world;" "Hail, O Light, for Light has shined upon us from heaven, upon us who were buried in darkness." "Oh, pure Light! I am led by the Light of the earth to the view of heaven." "The LORD is the Hierophant Who, leading to the light the candidate for initiation, *seals* him, and presents the believer to the FATHER to be preserved for ever."

Origen, in his commentary upon Rom. v. (12 ad fin.,) writes as if he had been prophetically gifted with a knowledge of the teaching which a portion of the Catholic Church would one day propound; with their attempt to put Eve and Mary in the stead of Adam and CHRIST. In his explanation of the latter part of the fifth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, Origen quotes more than once S. Paul's words, "As in ADAM all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive," (1 Cor. xv. 22,) dwelling upon the remarkable difference of tenses in the words in apposition (*ἐποθνήσκουσιν—ζωοποιηθήσονται*,) and then passing on to comment upon the relations of the first to the Second Adam. "And firstly let us see how, through the *man*, sin entered into the world, and death by sin. For perhaps some one may ask if the woman sinned

before Adam, of whom it is said that, 'being deceived, she was in the transgression,' (1 S. Tim. ii. 14;) and again, before her the serpent sinned, for he sinned when he said to the woman, 'Yea, hath God said,' (Gen. iii. 1;) and again he sinned when he said, 'For God doth know,' &c., (Gen. iii. 5.) If, therefore, the woman sinned before Adam, and the serpent before the woman; and the Apostle says in another place that 'Adam was not deceived, but the woman being deceived,' (1 S. Tim. ii. 14;) how will it appear that by one *man*, and not rather by one *woman*, sin entered? For the beginning of sin was from the woman, and before the woman from the serpent, or the devil; of whom it is said in the Gospel that 'he was a murderer from the beginning.' But see in these words that the Apostle clave to the order of nature; and therefore, since he was speaking of sin, by which death had passed upon all men, he ascribes the succession of human posterity which yielded to this death coming from sin, *not to the woman*, but to the man. For posterity is not named from the woman, but from the man, as the Apostle himself says in other places: 'For the man is not of the woman, but the woman of the man,' (1 Cor. xi. 8;) and again, "For as the woman is of (ex) the man, so the man is not of (ex,) but by (per,) the woman; [Elsewhere, commenting on Gal. iv. 4, Origen remarks, "We ought not to give heed to those who say that CHRIST was born (per) by Mary, and not (ex) of Mary; the Apostle does not say 'by' (*διὰ*), but (*ἐκ* = ex) 'of' the woman," (in Apol.);] and on account of mortal posterity and bodily succession, sin is attributed to *man* rather as its author, and not to woman. But to render more evident what we have said we will add, what the same Apostle writes to the Hebrews, 'Levi also, who receiveth tithes, payed tithes in Abraham. For he was yet in the loins of his father, when Melchisedec met him,' (Heb. vii. 9, 10) 'returning from the slaughter of the kings.' (Gen. xiv. 17.) If therefore Levi, who was born in the fourth generation after Abraham, is considered to have been in 'the loins' of Abraham, how much more all men who are born and have been born in this world were in the loins of Adam, when as yet he was in Paradise; and all men with him, or in him, were expelled from Paradise when he himself was driven out: and by HIM death, which had come from his prevarication consequently passed over into those who were esteemed to be in his loins: and therefore rightly the Apostle says, 'For as in Adam all die, even so in CHRIST shall all be made alive.' (1 Cor. xv. 22.) Therefore, neither of (ex) the serpent who had sinned before the woman, nor of (ex) the woman who sinned before the man, but by (per) Adam (of whom we all take our origin) it is said that sin entered into the world, and death by sin. But he is indisputably the 'one man' through whom sin entered, and death by sin; and him the Apostle speaks of as "the first man, of the earth, earthy; the second Man, the LORD from heaven' (1 Cor. xv. 47.)

when he bids us, the image of the earthly being cast away, to bear the image of the heavenly." (Ad Rom. lib. v.) It is singular, that often as Origen mentions Adam by name, he, following S. Paul's example, speaks of Eve merely as "the woman," so little value did either the Apostle or the Father set upon her name. In the exposition of the Magnificat the origin of sin is placed to the account of the woman. "As sin began from the woman and thence passed to the man, so the beginning of salvation had its origin from *the women* (à mulieribus,) that other women also, the weakness of the sex being put aside, might imitate the life and conversation of those holy women who are more especially described in the Gospel." (Hom. viii. in Luc.) Not à muliere from *the woman*—the second Eve—but the plural is used instead of the singular, as if to disallow any special parallel between Eve and Mary. As to Mary being filled with grace from the moment of her conception or of her birth, Origen expressly denies this assumption in the sentence which reads thus ; " Spiritu itaque sancto TUNC repleta est Maria, QUANDO cœpit in utero habere salvatorem. Statim enim ut Spiritum sanctum accepit, dominici corporis conditorem, et filius Dei esse cœpit in utero, *etiam ipsa completa est Spiritu sancto.*" (Hom. vii. in Luc.) The "tunc," "quando," and "etiam," limit sufficiently the time of the Blessed Virgin's reception of the HOLY GHOST, and when His indwelling power is allowed for, we do not find Origen attributing to her any supernatural grace in his analysis of the Magnificat, more than he would have allowed to any of God's prophets under the elder dispensation. Certainly there is nothing in the writings of Origen, either indirectly or directly, which would support the Roman development of Mary being the "second Eve," so that *this* Antenicene Father cannot be said in the least "to invalidate the testimony of the three Fathers concerning" the Blessed Virgin: he thought of her as they thought of her; he allowed her perpetual virginity, which was going beyond Tertullian, but by none of them was she held to be more than a mere human instrument chosen by the Divine purpose to be the channel of great grace. S. Cyprian, as is well known, was a great student in, and admirer of Tertullian; he must from this circumstance have been deeply read in the higher economies of the Christian dispensation: for revealed as well as natural religion meets with a subtle as well as with a very didactic treatment at the hands of Tertullian. On the whole, writing with due reverence, we must allow that the mind of the master was of a higher intellectual capacity than that of the pupil: yet the cardinal doctrines of the faith are explicitly stated by S. Cyprian in his "Epistles" rather than in his "Treatises." In his works we find *no* reference to Mary; our Blessed Lord, in His various offices, is ever spoken of, but Mary never. Eve receives no mention at his hands; yet from one passage we can prove

that like Origen, he refers the head of sin, not to Eve but to Adam. Speaking of old offenders even not being hindered from obtaining baptismal grace, he adds: "How much more ought not an infant to be prohibited, who newly born, has sinned in nothing, except that being born carnally after *Adam* (secundum Adam) it contracted by the first nativity contagion of the ancient death." (Ep. lix. 5, Bened.)

Nor is mention of the Virgin made in Lactantius and Arnobius; and the most that can be gleaned from S. Hippolytus is, that the SAVIOUR was born of her without confusion of persons: the Creator of the universe from the all-holy (*παναγία*) and ever-virgin (*ἀειπαρθένος*) Mary, after an undefiled conception without changing (of nature,) substantiating to Himself an intellectual soul with the nature of a sensitive body, became man." (Cont. Ber. et Hil. § 8, p. 63, Ed. Lagarde.) Theodoret in his first Dialogue, gives a quotation from S. Hippolytus, in which he calls the SAVIOUR "the Ark from the undecaying wood; for His undecaying and uncorrupt tabernacle was made manifest in this, that it brought forth no corruption of sin. But the LORD was free from sin, according to man, of the undecaying *woods*, of the Virgin and of the HOLY SPIRIT, being within and without the Word of God, like to one overlaid with the most fine gold." (Frag. 127, Lagarde.) The student of the Greek Fathers will recognise at once the technical expression, *παναγία*, and *ἀειπαρθένος*—and will give them their full, but not more than their full value.

We have given the above passages from S. Hippolytus, not only because they are amongst the *very few* notices of the Virgin which we meet with in the Ante-Nicene Fathers, but because they teach us what her office was in the opinion of so great a man as the Bishop of Portus. She was the Mother of our LORD, and He was conceived in her by the HOLY GHOST without decay and without the corruption of sin. We read in his works nothing about her exaltation, her parallel with Eve, her intercessorial office. Upon the very points, on which according to some theologians, S. Hippolytus ought to have been most dogmatic in his teaching, he is altogether silent.

Before quitting the Ante-Nicene Fathers, it is to be noted that whatever hints according to the interpretation of some, S. Irenæus dropped about Eve and Mary, and about her being an "Advocate," they were not taken up and expanded by the succeeding Fathers; generation after generation passed away, the faith of the Church became more consolidated and more dogmatic, but the lines of argument which are supposed to have been laid down by S. Irenæus were not followed out. Now, had they been understood in the sense that some Roman commentators would give to them, they would not have been suffered to die away into silence; the inference seems to be a fair one then, that no such significance was attached to these expressions, and therefore they did not receive

any attention in the succeeding ages, although they fell from the lips of so bright an ornament of the second century.

Of the writers of the *fourth* century who express the Marian parallel, Dr. Newman quotes SS. Cyril of Jerusalem, Ephrem Syrus, Epiphanius, and Jerome. The passage from S. Cyril reads—"Since through Eve, a virgin, came death, it behoved that through a virgin, or rather from a virgin, should life appear; that as the serpent had deceived the one, so to the other Gabriel might bring good tidings. Cat. xii. 15." (P. 42.) This is only *one* reason out of many given by S. Cyril as to why our Blessed LORD came in the flesh; that we might bear the sight of God, that He might be baptized and hallow the waters of Baptism, that He might work wonders, &c.: and then this second reason is given, this supplementary reason, that Dr. Newman brings forward. It is a pretty type, but it does not dogmatically teach that the introduction of sin into the world was by Eve, for we read in the next lecture—"And indeed the sin of one man, of Adam, prevailed to bring death to the world. But if by the offence of one death reigned (Rom. v. 17) in the world, how shall not rather life reign 'by the righteousness of One.' If the First-formed from the earth brought in universal death, He Who formed him from the earth, shall He not bring in eternal life, being Himself the Life?" (Cat. xiii. 2.) Again: "For since by one man came death (Rom. v. 12, 17,) by one Man also came life, by one Man, the SAVIOUR." (Id. § 28.) In many places S. Cyril witnesses to the universality of sin. CHRIST by His sacrifice "has ransomed the whole world (*κόσμον ὅλον*) of men" (Id. i.) Micah vii. 2, Rom. iii. 12, and other passages of Holy Scripture are brought to prove the corruption of our *entire* race; "Jesus took on Him the sins of the world" (*τὰς οἰκουμένης ἁμαρτίας*. Cat. iii. § 12.) No exception is made whatever of the blessed Virgin, she was under sin as we are: CHRIST is truly our life, as well as the Life; the old and new natures have had a certain beginning in the first and Second Adam.

One other passage in S. Cyril deserves very careful consideration. It is on the miraculous birth of Eve. "A favour was due to men from the race of woman; for Eve was produced out of Adam, and was not conceived by a mother, but from a man alone, as it were, brought forth. Mary, therefore, repaid the debt of the benefit not by man, but by herself immaculately; having conceived of the HOLY GHOST by the power of GOD." (Cat. xii. 29.) This is a case in which the parallel ought to be pressed: but it would not hold good; it is a striking analogy, and nothing more. If any parallel be drawn, it must be between the birth of Eve and the birth of CHRIST, and from that no theological development could take its stand. As represented by S. Cyril, the fourth century speaks in stronger language than the preceding centuries, but he

does not bear any witness either to Mary's freedom from sin or to her exaltation, and yet the reader cannot fail to notice that there is a development in the teaching about the person of the Blessed Virgin in the writings of S. Cyril as compared with those of S. Cyprian, Origen, or S. Clement of Alexandria; a development decidedly more marked in the east than in the west. The student of Ecclesiastical history is at no loss to account for this phenomenon; its cause is not a recondite one; it is not a token of any particular, or divine inspiration, but a natural result flowing from the course of theological controversy. In various ways the human nature of our Blessed LORD was made the foundation of almost innumerable heresies. Every means was tried to lessen its humanity, or to destroy the belief in its real objective nature. What line could the Catholic Church adopt in her controversies other than she did with the same power and force? In every way she tried to strengthen the human nature of our LORD by binding up that nature more closely than heretofore with earthly ties. If then the Son was to be connected with the Mother, the Mother must be more prominently brought forward than she had been, she must be made much of, not in the way of sober hard doctrinal teaching, but by the way of light and fanciful allusions and parallels, the devotions of the faithful must be kindled towards her. Dr. Newman would regard this gradual process of sensualizing, as springing up from holy lives, from long seasons of quiet and contemplation, from the toning down of a glory so great that at the first it blinded men's eyes in the same way that to look upon a bright sunshine would blind them now. But is this a true solution of the question? Must not this developement be ascribed to a precisely opposite cause, and rather be attributed to theological controversy than the holy meditation and to an increased sanctity of and dwelling in the "hidden life?" For example, the special heresies with which S. Augustine had to contend, were not those of a docetic tinge, consequently he was not led to dwell upon the humanity of our Blessed LORD, or to connect it in any special way with its earthly relationship. This was the case in the opposite direction with S. Epiphanius, whom Dr. Newman quotes as another witness to the parallel between Mary and Eve. That wonderful *Encomium* on the "Holy Mother of God," which gives this parallel in its strongest form; as for example: "The angels blamed Eve, but how they glorify Mary; she who rightly glorified the infirmity of woman: she, who raised up the fallen Eve: she, who sent Adam into heaven, who was cast out of Paradise; she, who opened the closed door of Paradise. By thee, O holy Virgin, the middle wall of partition (τὸ μεσότοιχον) was broken down . . . Mary, heavenly spouse,"—is allowed by Petauius to be spurious in common with the other eight sermons: "satis cum stylo ipso, tum aliis quibusdam indiciiis;" so that they would have been no loss had they been omitted, he says, from

his edition. We fall back, therefore, upon the 88th section of the Panarion which consists of a letter written by S. Epiphanius from Arabia, in which he gives an account of a certain sect called the *Antidicomarians* and refutes their particular heresy. He describes them as having an enmity to the Virgin, and as desiring to hold her glory very cheap: being puffed up either with envy or with error, and wishing to pollute the minds of men, they had dared to say, that the Holy Mary, after the birth of CHRIST, had intercourse with her husband Joseph; which notion, they said, is derived from that old man Apollinaris himself, or from some of his disciples. The refutation of these *Antidicomarians* is a masterly specimen of theological argument, filling no less than twenty-four page of Petavius' edition of this father. It is from this Antidicomarian letter that Dr. Newman's citation is made. S. Epiphanius uses very strong language. Mary is Eve, the mother of all living, by enigma; it was a wonder that after the fall Eve had this great cognomen—both to Eve and Mary a common cause for wonder; Eve had become an occasion (*πρόφασις*) of death to the human race, for by her death entered into the world; and Mary an occasion of life, for of her was born life. For this cause the Son of God came into the world, "That where sin abounded," &c. (Rom. v. 20,) whence came death—there life obtained place,—that life might be instead of death; having excluded the death that was (*ἐκ*) from the woman; once more, He, our life, being born by means of (*διὰ*) the woman. The old distinction holds good here: death, according to S. Epiphanius, was out of Eve; whilst life was only through the instrumentality of Mary. We must bear in mind in estimating the value of the testimony of S. Epiphanius how far he allowed his veneration of the Virgin Mary to carry him. The history of the Church is carried down by the Acts of the Apostles to the year A.D. 68; at this time the Virgin must have been, had she lived so long, some eighty years old: nearly of the same age with Anna, who "was of a great age." The probability is, however, that she must have died many years before S. John, who survived his Divine Master about sixty years. The death of the Virgin, like her life, as apart from her Lord and Son receives no light from Holy Scripture, and so S. Epiphanius, doubtful of her mortality, can hardly bring himself to believe that she died at all. It is not allowable for us to pick and choose in regard to the writings of the holy Fathers if we truly accept them as Dr. Newman does, as certain sure words of testimony; or otherwise we may simply read them for "instruction in righteousness," without building the essential articles upon their oftentimes crude and fluctuating notions. If we receive the Marian parallel because S. Epiphanius lays it down to us, then are we equally bound to doubt as to whether the Virgin ever died; and if she never died, whether she ever sinned, and if she never sinned then she must have been immaculately conceived;

and if she was immaculately conceived, then she is worthy of all honour, reverence, and worship from us poor sinful mortals; and the most extravagant form of Mariolatry rests upon a secure and doctrinal foundation. The following passages from the Antidicomarian letter of S. Epiphanius ought to be carefully digested as bearing upon the value of his statements in regard to the parallel between Eve and Mary: "For whether the holy Virgin died and is buried, her sleep is in honour; her end is in purity; her crown in virginity; whether she was slain according to the words, 'a sword shall pass through,' &c. (S. Luke ii. 35,) her glory is among the martyrs, and her holy body among the blessings, through whom light shined upon the world—or whether she remained; for is not God able to do everything that He wills? No one knows her end." (c. xxiii.) Again; the same prophecy from S. Luke is quoted, and in addition to this Rev. xii. 13, upon which S. Epiphanius observes, "Perhaps this can be fulfilled in her; but I do not certainly affirm this, and I do not say that she remained immortal, but neither am I able to affirm that she died, for the Scripture exceeds the mind of man, and it has left the matter among the things that are unrevealed on account of the honoured and most incomparable way, lest any one should be in conjecture about the concerns of her way. We know not, therefore, whether she died, and if she is buried, whether she is united with the flesh: God forbid." (c. xii.) S. Epiphanius seems to have overlooked the simplest explanation of the matter, that when apart from the life of our LORD, either the death, or the burial, of the Virgin are matters of the profoundest indifference to the Catholic Church at large.

The doubtful credulity of S. Epiphanius is wholly eclipsed by the bold and reckless assumption with which S. Jerome expresses his fiery and brilliant thoughts. Who could build their faith upon what S. Jerome wrote? He contradicts in one place what he says in another; he asserts in his commentaries upon Daniel and Micah that the world shall last but one thousand years; in other places, that God's providence extends to man alone; that there was a pre-existence of souls: he endorses many of the wildest fancies of Origen. Let any reflective theologian read the commentary of S. Jerome upon the fourth chapter of the prophet Amos, and then let him ask himself whether his teacher is a guide whom it would be safe implicitly to follow. The first quotation from S. Jerome, as given by Dr. Newman, is taken from the 22nd epistle to Eustochium, "He says 'death by Eve, life by Mary:—' in the epistle from which I have quoted he is only adding another virtue to that union which gained for Mary her Divine maternity," (p. 43.) This is a curious treatise by which to uphold any doctrine, for it contains some very curious statements. We are told in a preceding section of it that the writer was brought before the tribunal of CHRIST for reading Cicero and Plautus, and that he was there well flogged, and struck

down to the earth : he did not dare to look up ; he was asked as to who he was, and on answering that he was a Christian, the presiding judge said, " You lie, you are a Ciceronian ; where your treasure is, there will your heart be also." He was silent, and having been ordered to be cudgelled, between the blows he heard a voice saying, " In hell who shall confess thee ?" and he began to cry out, and wailing to say, " Have mercy upon me, O LORD ;" and then lying at the knees of the judge his assessors prayed for his pardon on account of his youth, and that the rest of the sentence be stayed unless he should read any more heathen books. S. Jerome did more than promise, he swore never to read profane literature. His oath liberated him ; he returned to earth, his eyes suffused with tears. It is these words that make the story so curious, "*Nec vero sopor ille fuerat aut vana somnia, quibus sæpe deludimur. Testis est tribunal illud, ante quod jacui, testis iudicium triste, quod timui, ita mihi nunquam contingat in talem incidere quæstionem, *liventes habuisse scapulas, plagas sensisse* post somnium, et tanto dehinc studio divina legisse, quanto non ante mortalia legeram.*" This tale, which is valueless itself, is of inestimable value in enabling us to understand S. Jerome's style of writing. S. Jerome says most positively that this was no trance or vain dream ; that his very shoulders were livid ; that on awakening he felt the strokes which had been inflicted upon him ; that he had sworn to read no more profane writings ; and he bids Eustochium frame her studies upon the lesson taught by this dreadful and supernatural occurrence. This was not a narration that Ruffinus was likely to let pass without comment ; he quotes S. Jerome's account of the matter word for word. " Have you heard," he asks, " to what a novel and honourable kind of oath he had espoused himself ? the Judge, our LORD JESUS CHRIST, sitting upon His tribunal, angels assisting and interceding for him, amid blows and torture he swore neither to have nor to read secular books. Let what he writes be re-read, and I ask if in one page of his work he does not mention Cicero again and again, and he not only speaks of ' our Tully,' but of ' our Flaccus,' ' our Maro.' " Then Ruffinus shows how S. Jerome quotes the ancient philosophers. " And now he not only possesses and reads, not alone describes and compares, but also mingles them among the Divine words, and the discourses of ecclesiastical edification." How does S. Jerome reply to this, and to much more direct accusation of the same tenor—" You demand from me sleeping (a dormiente) what you never performed when waking : " " I promised not to read being impressed in sleep (in somnis.) " He refers moreover to the difference between his own sleep and that of Ruffinus (meum somnum.) " Ego humiliter reprehensum refero." To Eustochium the oath is spoken of as being most binding : to Ruffinus as being but the powerful impression of an uneasy dream. There can be no doubt which is the true interpre-

tation of the matter, but that does not make the contradiction of S. Jerome the less.

Another story is told in this epistle of a Nitrian monk being found dead in his cell with a hundred *solidi* in his possession, and how Macarius, Pambo, and Isidore, the other monks, dismissed the notion of applying this money to the poor or for ecclesiastical purposes, but buried it with the body, saying, "Thy money perish with thee." S. Jerome approves of this act. These matters are mentioned because they throw much light upon the temper of Jerome's mind, and they are to a certain extent guides as to how far we should implicitly be led by what he teaches. Any real student of his writings must have arrived at the conclusion, that while the piety of S. Jerome was very fervent and real and his learning was most profound, his *judgment* was not to be depended upon. To enormous industry combined with a marvellous rapidity of composition we are indebted for much that he wrote; of the calm, contemplative, philosophical aspect of the faith he was in no sense a partaker. To return, however, to Dr. Newman's particular passage, which reads thus, taken with its context, "Truly after the Virgin had conceived in her womb, had brought forth a Son of Whom 'the government shall be upon His shoulder,' (Isa. ix. 6,) God the strong, the Father of future ages, the curse was dissolved. Death through Eve, life through Mary. And therefore also the gift of virginity for a longer time flowed down upon women, because it began from woman. But immediately the SON of God walked upon earth, He established for Himself a new family, that He Who was adored by angels in heaven might have angels also upon earth." Elsewhere S. Jerome tells Eustochium that she should place before her Blessed Mary, "*quæ tantæ extitit puritatis, ut mater Domini esse mereretur.*" Still, while S. Jerome writes all this to Eustochium, in his commentary on 1 Cor. xv. 22, he says, "As death entered in through Adam, for he first died, so entered in the resurrection through CHRIST, because He first rose from the dead; and as that man was a pattern of the dying, so was this a pattern of those rising from the dead. . . . As in Adam we are mortal, so in CHRIST we shall be immortal." This testimony is, however, of small account, because in Rom. v. 12, upon the words, "As by one man sin entered into the world," we find S. Jerome writing, "*Si per unum hominem Evam,*" &c. ! A commentator that can so paraphrase is of small value for the controversial establishment of doctrine, and says Dr. Newman, "S. Jerome speaks for the *whole world* except Africa," (p. 44;) so that, according to Dr. Newman, the whole catholic world witnessed to and supported the teaching of S. Jerome; and if on this, so also upon other questions, the "whole world" was bound with and confirmed the curious speculations which S. Jerome inherited from Origen. Surely such reasoning as this cannot hold water, for the Church

Catholic has never given the sovereign sway to any one Father that Dr. Newman claims for each of his witnesses. If our space did not forbid us we could show that the teaching of S. Fulgentius in the main runs counter to these assertions of S. Jerome, and so it might be said of a long list of Post-Nicene Fathers. But the point which we alone wanted to establish was this, that the Ante-Nicene Fathers whilst using the words quoted by Dr. Newman did not mean them to bear his interpretation, and we think that our readers will agree that we have proved this point. In regard to the later Fathers mentioned we have wished to show that there are certain drawbacks to our accepting their statements as worthy of belief because they have uttered them; but that before we do this we are bound to examine whether they are consistent in their teaching or not. It is satisfactory that neither Canon Oakeley nor Father Gallwey have made any direct appeal to patristic authority. The Biblical interpretation which is contained in the "Lady Chapel" of the latter gentleman is of a most astonishing nature; suffice it to say that the Roman commentators of any pretensions to learning, and especially those of his own order, the Society of Jesus, would be as much amused as they would be scandalized by the reckless and extravagant assertions of this new prophet of their order and champion of their faith. Such reasoning as that of Father Gallwey is in its place in a worship that dresses up the image of a woman in fine clothes and sings litanies to it when illuminated with lighted candles all around it; but it is entirely out of place in the Roman Church as it was left and as it worshipped even so lately as the Council of Trent. The expressions of SS. Epiphanius and Jerome may be unguarded, vehement, or "too superstitious," but their very hair would stand on end on reading the theology which is propounded by "the Rev. Father Gallwey, S. J.:" the former would most certainly cry out, 'Ἐταῖρε, ἐφ' ᾧ πᾶρει; σὺ διδάσκεις ἡμᾶς; μαίνει καὶ γὰρ ἡ λαλιά σου δῆλόν σε ποιεῖ.

FREEMAN'S RITES AND RITUAL.

Rites and Ritual: a Plea for Apostolic Doctrine and Worship.

By PHILIP FREEMAN, M.A., Archdeacon of Exeter. London: Murray. 1866.

THIS is a truly seasonable publication, and cannot fail, we think, to effect to a very considerable extent the object which the excellent author proposes to himself, and which he shall describe in his own words:—

"For the second time within our memory a 'vestment' or 'ritual'

controversy has arisen among us. The last time it was about 'the surplice' in preaching, as against the gown; and the 'prayer for the Church Militant,' as against the disuse of it. This time it is about the more distinctive Eucharistic vestments, as against the surplice; and about a fuller ritual as against a scantier one. Now the last contest was simply a miserable one. I venture to call it so, 1st, because, handled as it was, there was no sort of principle at stake in it, beyond that of assigning to the sermon more nearly its due position and estimate in the rite; and that of adding one more prayer—a touching and valuable one, it is true—to the ordinary office;—and next, because it utterly misconceived and missed the Church's real mind, in allowing such a thing at all as prayers, or a service at the Altar or Holy Table, when there was to be no Offering and no Communion. To restore the prayer for the Church Militant, and to be content with that, was indeed 'to keep the word of promise to her ear and break it to her hopes.' Only as a protest, only as a badge of her rejection—ay, and of CHRIST's rejection by the world—had she ever condescended to such a LORD'S Day Service as that at all.

"What was the result and upshot, as might have been expected, of that contest? In the case of some parishes, and almost whole dioceses, successful rebellion against even the letter of the rubric; and in places where the result was different, a contented acquiescence ever since (for the most part) in the victory achieved. Is it not evident that it was not worth achieving? And why? Because all the while the Church's real desire and aim was ignored; she was not one whit nearer to the Apostolic rule, but only proclaimed more distinctly her departure from it.

"And now that another 'vestment' and 'ritual' controversy has arisen, the great anxiety, and the only *deep* anxiety, of the Church should be, that it too pass not over us barren of all results of value. It will do so, if it only leaves us with a better ascertained law as to the relative obligation of this or that vestment, the lawfulness of this or that mode of ritual. It will have been in vain, unless it brings *up* our long-standing neglect on the one hand, and brings *back* our more novel excesses on the other, to the true standard of God's own providing. But on the other hand, if haply, while we are searching for a rule, we shall have found a principle, and begun to act upon it, then the present excitement will have done a great work for us.

"And happily, it is by thus lifting the existing controversy into a higher sphere, we shall have the best chance of reconciling and harmonising positions now ranged over against each other, and even of solving this ritual and vestment difficulty. For let us suppose, on the one side—what it is not too much to hope for—that the close sifting, both of doctrine and ritual, which such a period as this gives rise to, joined to the fatherly counsel of the Bishops, and to considerations of Christian wisdom and charity, should avail to remove such peculiarities of ritual as are plainly either indefensible or inexpedient. And let us suppose, on the other side—what surely we may no less hope for—an earnest effort now made by the clergy, encouraged by their bishops, to return to the Apostolic usage of Weekly Celebration, and in other ways to give due honour and observance to the Holy Eucharist. Suppose

this done on either side, and there would at once result a great and essential *rapprochement* between those who now have the appearance of raising opposite cries, and wearing rival badges."—Pp. 90—92.

It is for the weekly celebration that Archdeacon Freeman chiefly pleads; and he would have the Sacrament "in such wise done and ministered as the good Fathers in the Primitive Church frequented it." (See Second Book of Homilies.) Consequently he advocates the general adoption of the Eucharistic vestments, foregoing for the present, where necessary, the distinction of colour, and would have the Priest stand in his proper place before the Altar. Also he asks "toleration" for the two lights on the Altar, (for these we think he might ask a little more,) for the mixed chalice, and the non-ceremonial use of incense.

The points on which the Archdeacon would desire to restrain recent doctrinal and ritualistic developments, are (1) the use of language which implies the presence of CHRIST personally (as distinct from His Body and Blood) upon the Altar; (2) non-communicating attendance; (3) elevation.

On the subject last named, however, he admits that "a slight raising of the Elements in the consecration is an ancient and probably universal custom." With regard to the other two, we will take leave to suggest two considerations which do not seem to have been taken into account by our author. 1. We would ask Mr. Freeman how, in his view of the Presence, he could escape the materialistic practice (as he would call it) of apostrophising the Body and Blood? which we feel sure would be more revolting to him, than the worshipping of CHRIST present on the Altar. And here too we would say that it is not fair to speak of the Article "forbidding" the worship of CHRIST: it certainly does not do this. 2. In dealing with the cases of persons who do not wish to communicate, Mr. Freeman should also be much more precise. Presuming that he would not turn any person out of church, (indeed, this would be beyond his archidiaconal powers,) what is to be said to those who plead conscientious observance of what S. Augustine calls the Apostolic tradition of not communicating after a meal? Again, what is to be said to children, especially if they have been confirmed? Oftentimes they would not be fit to communicate, and what should be done with them?

The part of the pamphlet that is most interesting and original is the way in which the Archdeacon identifies the Eucharistic vestments with the dress of the Jewish High Priest.

At its present price this pamphlet is only within the reach of a few. We earnestly hope that, when two or three editions have been sold off, Mr. Freeman will arrange with his publisher to have it sold at sixpence. We do not know anything so well calculated to introduce the subject of worship to all ranks of Churchmen.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Libri Precum Publicarum Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ Versio Latina. A GUL. BRIGHT, A.M., et P. G. MEDD, A.M., Presbyteris, Collegii Universitatis in Acad. Oxon. facta. Apud Rivington, Londini, Oxonii, Cantabrigiæ. 1865.

Messrs. Bright and Medd had a more difficult task before them when they undertook to compile a Latin Prayer Book, than appears at first sight, though certainly it is a difficulty that ought not to have existed. Why the compilers of the Reformed Offices neglected to issue a Latin Version, as well as an English one, is by no means clear. The Convocation had always, and to this day still has preserved its ecclesiastical custom of publishing its canons in Latin as well as English; in like manner the XXXIX. Articles; why not its Book of Offices? The only one that has appeared with the slightest show of authority is that of 1560. This Version was issued for the purpose of serving for the private use of the Clergy, namely, for daily recitation when the English form was not said publicly in church, as well as for public recitation in the colleges of Winchester and Eton, together with those of the two Universities. Yet this Version has never been revised publicly, nor conformed to subsequent alterations made in our Book of Offices. The unfortunate result is, that these colleges which still use the Latin form have been obliged to provide unauthorised Versions, of a very degenerate character; pseudo-classic, like Jacobean architecture. These Versions are not even alluded to by Messrs. Bright and Medd. Some might have expected that the Latin Version of 1560 would form the basis of this new one, that the editors would have taken this Version, and only altered it, or added to it, where corresponding additions and alterations have been made in the English. They have not done this, giving their reasons in the preface: "*Nec tamen omnino imitandum putavimus, quippe qui nec publicam ecclesiæ auctoritatem præ se ferret, nec novis postea recensionibus factis, cum hodierno libro satis consentiret.*"

It is also a fact, that the Latin and English of 1560 are not translations, either of the other, but distinct Versions, not verbally equivalent, either in the Prayers or in the Rubrics; one of the most remarkable differences being found in the Kalendar, where nearly every day of each month has the name of some saint attached to it. The editors, therefore, went back to the Sarum Books, and where the English Office is clearly a translation of the Sarum, there they gave the Latin of the Sarum. In the Psalms, Canticles, and Epistles and Gospels, they have taken the Vulgate, as it is in the older Offices.

The editors were prompted to undertake this work, as they tell us in their preface, for the use of travellers abroad, and for private recitation but we strongly suspect that the more powerful reason was the resolution of the S. P. C. K. to issue a Latin translation of the Prayer Book, as it had done with modern languages. The matter was intrusted to Dr. Jacobson, now Bishop of Chester, then Regius Professor of Theology.

The learned professor was, we are informed, actually engaged in making an entirely new translation of the whole Prayer Book into his own Latin, even the Psalter and the portions of Holy Scripture, when he had at hand the Vulgate Bible, and the Sarum Office Book, from whence our book is compiled. The fact seemed incredible, until a meeting of the S. P. C. K. revealed the truth, that there are actually among us still men of such strong Protestant prejudices, that they cannot endure the Vulgate, the Bible of S. Augustine, and all the Latin Fathers since the days of S. Jerome, because it is sanctioned by the Roman Church. It seems to be thought that that dreaded phantom "Popery" lies under the letter of the Vulgate, and that those who read that Version are, by the act of doing so, in danger of becoming "Papists." While, on the other hand, there is a sort of triple shield in "our Protestant Bible." Such persons are, of course, beyond the reach of reason. They are doubtless of the like mind as those who overwhelmed the Princess of Wales with huge Bibles, being apparently under the impression that the mere possession of an immense number of Bibles would make the Princess, by some magical power, or sacramental *opus operatum*, an exemplary wife of our future king.

We strongly advise all our readers, who are likely to travel abroad, to supply themselves with this "Liber Precum;" and we venture to express a hope that those who stay at home will use the book in their private recitation of the office, instead of the English.

Incense: a Liturgical Essay. By R. F. LITLEDALE, M.A., LL.D.,
Priest of the English Church. London: Palmer.

In this treatise we have an historical account of the use of incense in Pagan, Jewish, and Christian times. In examining the latter, the author tells us,

"we are met with great obscurity, and much conflict of testimony. One thing is certain, or nearly so, that the use of incense was not at first universal; but that it dated in some places from Apostolic times seems incontrovertible. There are two theories which may account for the diversity of custom, either of which is sufficient to explain the fact. Either there may have been a distinctly different tradition handed down in different Churches, as was unquestionably the case as regards the time for observing Easter (since as early as A.D. 158, S. Polycarp of Smyrna, and S. Anicetus of Rome, each pleaded Apostolic sanction for his diverse use,) or local circumstances may have given rise to the necessary abandonment in some places of a non-essential, though primitive, custom. There is no trace at all of the first rise of the practice in the East, where it has been universally observed; there are marks of original use, subsequent abandonment, and final restoration in the West, while the African Church appears to have never adopted incense at all."—P. 9.

With regard to the use of incense in England since the Reformation, Dr. Littledale's inquiries do not add anything to the information already available. There is no doubt that individuals have used it, and that mention of incense-pots or boats existing in churches occasionally is to be found, and, in one place, of a censer. Never-

theless, no evidence has yet been produced of incense having been used as a formal Liturgical adjunct.

In one important particular Dr. Littledale's reasoning seems to us faulty: it is in reference to the well-known prophecy of Malachi, where he argues that, because the "pure offering" is "literally" the oblation of the Eucharist, therefore "incense" must be taken literally. But the "pure offering" is not literally the Eucharist: it is a type of it; and by parity of reason "incense" must be understood typically. And in another part of the essay he tells us that incense typifies "the mediation of CHRIST."

The Rev. G. WEBSTER, the Rector of S. Nicolas', Cork, has kindly sent us an account of a system which he has carried on successfully with the view of encouraging systematic benevolence. It is not done through the offertory, but by means of collecting papers, and enables him entirely to dispense with "charity sermons."

Still more gratifying is the last Report of the S. George's Mission, which is certainly the greatest work accomplished by the Church in our day. To see two churches built in that wretched district, with all the accompaniments of a Sisterhood, a Penitentiary, and Schools, &c., is a well-earned reward for the persevering labours of Mr. Lowder. But more than this, it is undoubtedly true that the Mission has inaugurated a new method of work for our large town parishes, which is being extensively followed. The influence of the Church may just now be said to be beginning to be felt in London, which till quite lately was nothing but a great spiritual wilderness.

Mr. Parker has published a beautiful quarto edition of the *Imitation*. A seventh edition of Dr. NEALE'S most successful translation of the *Rhythm of S. Bernard* has also been issued by Mr. Hayes; and a second of Mr. LEE'S *Beauty of Holiness*.

Several Sermons preached on the occasion of the Cattle Plague have reached us, of which one by Mr. BENSON, (Rivington,) is deep and philosophical; and one by Mr. BAIRD, (Mozley,) eloquent and impressive. Dr. PAYNE SMITH'S, (Parker,) preached at S. Mary's, Oxford, though not other than good, strikes us as scarcely worthy of the time and place.

Twelve Short and Simple Meditations on the Sufferings of our Lord Jesus Christ, (Masters,) edited by Mr. BUTLER, of Wantage, though appearing late for the present year, will, we are sure, win themselves a place in the devotional library of Church people. No account is given us of the source from which they are taken; but we doubt not that they are adapted from some old writer. They are devout, yet not extravagant; while in size they occupy a middle place between the Bishop of Brechin's "Suffering Life of our LORD," and his more recent translation from the Italian.

Two Laymen have addressed *Letters* to the Bishop of London, (Palmer,) claiming toleration at least for recent ritualistic developments.

ROBERT MANNYNG, THE LINCOLNSHIRE CANON OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

THE fourteenth century is in many ways one of the most interesting periods in our ecclesiastical history. The effect of the long series of exactions and injustice perpetrated by the Court of Rome upon the Anglican Church was now apparent in threatening and ominous demonstrations against the Italian party. A strong feeling of nationality was being developed. The first and third Edwards were heartily backed by the sentiment of the country in opposing ultramontane tyranny. Even the weak and effeminate Edward II. showed some spirit in this matter. In his time occurred the first instance recorded in our history of a clerk being regularly tried and convicted by a jury of laymen.¹ But it is not only, nor principally, in its outward historical features that the interest of this period lies. It is chiefly that now we begin first to get a distinct glance at the inward thought and feeling of the men of the land. A group of early English writers, all occupied with discussing the manners and customs of their time with a view to their reformation and amendment, belongs to this period. In the North Richard Rolle, the Yorkshire hermit, was rapidly sending forth his works in English and Latin, in prose and verse; in Lincolnshire Robert Mannyng, the Gilbertine canon, was writing his long poem on the sins and vices of the age. In Kent a moral poem on the same subject was being composed by Dan Michel, of Northgate; while amongst the Malvern hills Robert Longland, the most acute and bitter of satirists, was drawing a picture of his age full of the deepest interest. All these date within fifty years of one another; and, without mentioning the court poets Chaucer and Gower, or those occupied simply with romantic subjects, as the authors of the Arthur poems, avail to give us a sketch of the time which well deserves attention.

In the present article we propose to confine ourselves to Robert Mannyng, more commonly known as Robert de Brunne, and to endeavour to give an account of his poem, "*Handlyng Synne*," which may perhaps attract some of our readers to a nearer acquaintance with the writer. And first of the man himself. We are, unfortunately, rather limited in our materials for making a sketch of his life. In two passages, one at the beginning of the "*Handlyng Synne*," the other in the introduction to the version which he made of *Piers Langtoft's Chronicle*, he speaks of himself. From these we gather that he was called Robert of Brunne, from his having been born at Brunne, or Bourn, in Lincolnshire. He was

¹ Adam Tarlton, Bishop of Hereford: Fuller's Church Hist. v. 32.
VOL. XXVIII.—MAY, 1866.

not, however, professed in the famous monastery of that place, but became a canon in the Gilbertine priory of Sempringham, about eight miles from Bourn. Here he tells us—

"I dwelled in the priory
 Fyftene zere in cumpanye,
 In the tyme of gode Dane Jone
 Of Camelton, that now ys gone.
 In hys time was Y there ten zeres,
 And knewe and herde of hys maneres;
 Sythyn wyth Dane Jone of Clyntone
 Fyve wyntyr wyth hym gan Y wone.
 Dan Felyp was mayster that tyme
 That Y began thys Englyssh ryme,
 The yeres of grace fyl than to be
 A thousynd and thre hundred and thre."

Handlyng Synne, l. 65.

After his fifteen years' residence at Sempringham, Robert Mannyng left the Gilbertine house, and lived at Brymwake, in Kesteven. We are unable to identify this place, or to ascertain whether it was a small religious house, or merely a private dwelling. Here, however, he was living when he wrote his "*Handlyng Synne*," and from this place he dates his salutation to the reader. Certainly Robert Mannyng had not abandoned his order, nor changed his course of life; for, some thirty years afterwards, when he was making his translation of *Piers Langtoft*, he tells us—

"In the third Edwardes tyme was I
 Whenne I wrote alle this story.
 In the house of Sixille I was a throwe,
 Dan Robert of Maltone, that ye know,
 Did¹ it write for felawes sake,
 Whenne thai wild solace take."

Introd. to Langtoft.

Now at Six-hills, about four miles from Market-Rasen, in Lincolnshire, was a Gilbertine priory, founded in the reign of Stephen by Albert de Greslei; and here it was that Robert, expert in making English rhyme, produced his translation of the "*Chronicle*," at the request of the prior, Dan Robert, to give wholesome amusement to the brethren of the house when they required relaxation from their religious duties. We can thus trace, although only in outline, the life of Robert Mannyng, from his entrance into the house of Sempringham in 1272, to his completion of his "*Langtoft*" in 1338, a period of sixty-six years.

"Of Brunne I am, if any me blame,
 Robert Mannyng is my name."

And as he is careful to tell us his name, so is he also to explain his

¹ Caused it to be written.

object in writing. He says at the beginning of his "*Handlyng Synne*"—

"For lewde men Y undertoke
On Englyssh tunge to make thys boke,
For many ben of swyche manere,
That talys and rymys wyl blethly here;
Yn gamys and festys and at the ale,
Love men to lestene trotevale;¹
That may fall ofte to vylanye,
To dedly synne or other folys;
For swyche men have Y mad thes ryme,
That they may wel dyspende there tyme;
And there-yn sumwhat for to here,
To leve all swyche foul manere,
And for to kunne² knowe therynne
That they were no synne be ynne."

Handlyng Synne, 43.

With this very praiseworthy object in view, the Gilbertine canon set himself to his task, and certainly he carried out his purpose. His book is not only amusing, but most valuable for its moral instruction; and though, in the stories which it contains, many puerilities and extravagances occur, yet, in the didactic part sound advice and sensible remarks predominate. We can very readily concur in Hearne's character of the writer, quoted in Mr. Furnivall's excellent preface to "*Handlyng Synne*." "We may easily gather that Robert of Brunne was of a cheerful, pleasant humour, and that he was very blithe and merry whenever he saw a proper occasion; at all which times, however, he behaved himself without any immoral or indecent expressions. He was naturally addicted to virtue, and his being engaged in a religious course of life made him have a stricter guard upon himself." (Hearne's Pref. to "*Langtoft*.") We should certainly infer, from many passages in Robert Mannyng's poem, that he was very strict in his notions of propriety, especially as regarded the associating with those of the other sex; and this is the more important, inasmuch as both the priories in which he lived were houses of both men and women, and one of them at least was a sort of by-word for ease and licence.³ It must, however, be remembered that Robert of Brunne was not, strictly speaking, an original writer. His "*Handlyng Synne*," if not exactly a translation, is yet a very

¹ Amusing talk, gossip.

² Be able.

³ Sempringham. Warton quotes a MS. from the Harleian Collection which makes this house among the most luxurious in England; it was the head house of the Gilbertine order, S. Gilbert having been born at Sempringham. In a note upon Warton (quoted by Mr. Furnivall, preface, p. 5) Sir F. Madden supposes that the John de Homerton, who died prior of Sempringham in 1282, was the "gode Dame Jane de Camelton" mentioned by Mannyng, under whom he lived ten years. If so, it would put his entrance into the priory in 1272. Dame Jane's successor was Roger de Bolingbrok, who died in 1298. After him came Philip de Burton, or Barton, the Dan Felyp who was master when Mannyng wrote his "*Handlyng*

close following of an old French poem, by one William of Wadinton, called "Manuel des Pechiez." This is given side by side with Mannyng's English in Mr. Furnivall's edition, and the best opportunity is thus afforded for comparing the two. It may be seen that, where the English writer leaves his French original, he goes into matter of his own, whether doctrine or stories, which he does to a very considerable extent, he faithfully preserves the tone, which appears in his close translations. Thus the whole may fairly be taken to represent Mannyng's genuine conviction and if so, it certainly entitles him to the praise due to a severe and exact moralist. Mr. Furnivall well observes of him: "The iron of the evil of sin has not entered into his soul so deeply as into that of the writer of *Piers Plowman*, the noblest of our early poets—even our Dante, as I judge—yet, after the manner of his order, and according to his light, he strives to warn from the evil, and to bring them to their God." (Preface, p. 10.)

But before we proceed to justify this high character of Mannyng by reference to his work, it is right to say a word of the original William of Wadinton, to whom certainly a similar praise is due.

He thus describes himself and his book:—

"Le escrit est petit, fet de gre
 Ke nul en lisant sait grevé,
 E ke meuz sait sanz ennu
 En memoire retenu;
 Volunters li parliez,
 Kar estret est de auctoritez,
 Si de faute i trovez,
 Pur Deu vus prie ke le amendez
 Car pecheur sui ky le compilai . . .
 De le franceis, ne del rimer
 Ne me dait nuls hom blamer,
 Kar en Engleterre fu ne,
 E norri, ordiné et alevé;
 De une vile sui nome
 Ou [ke] ne est burg ne cité.
 Pur coe prie Jeo pur JESU CRIST
 Ke ceus ky lirrunt cest escrit
 Pur Deu me aient en memoire,
 E pur moy prient le ray de gloire.
 De Deu seit beneit chescun hom
 Ky prie pur Wilham de Wadigtoun. . . ,
 Rien del mien ni mettrai,
 Fors sicum Jeo apris le ay.

Synne' at Brymwake. It is to be observed that Mannyng uses *master* in the sense of prior. At Sempringham resided the master of the Gilbertine order, that was the head house. In Philip's case the two offices were probably held by the same person. The revenues of Sempringham at the surrender were about £340. (Vide *Dugdale*, s. v. *Sempringham*.)

Nule faucerie ni troverez,
Plus volunteers le lisez."

This writer, then, was no more of an original than his copyist, Robert of Brunne. He speaks also in a tone equally humble of his own performance. In all probability the place from which he took his name was Waddington, about four miles from Lincoln, which may account for his work being known to Robert Mannyng, a Lincolnshire man also, and may also perhaps account for its having been attributed to Bishop Grostête.¹ (Preface, p. xiv.)

The work of Robert de Brunne, with which we are now concerned, and which may perhaps be styled an expansion or adaptation of that of William of Waddington, is a poem exclusively occupied with religious subjects. We have first the Ten Commandments treated of, then the seven deadly sins; next, the sin of sacrilege; then the seven Sacraments of Holy Church; lastly, shrift, its twelve points and twelve graces. The manner of treatment is to give first a rhyming exposition of the sin or grace, and then to illustrate the teaching by one or more stories. Some of these are narratives from Scripture, but the great majority are such tales as are constantly met with in mediæval writers. The principal actors in them are fiends, who get power by the sin of some unfortunate wretch to harass and torture, not only the soul, but the body also. Their fell attacks are usually made on the body after death, which, as their own special property, they tear and mangle, or throw out of its grave, or snatch away from its coffin, in spite of all efforts to reclaim it. Occasionally, also, the body of some unhappy defunct, which is already experiencing the pains of the condemned, is allowed to re-appear, to teach some awful lesson. A patristic authority is in some instances alleged for the stories, but usually they are told as of the writer's own knowledge; and here and there expressions occur which imply that the writer does not quite believe in the truth of what he is telling, but that he tells it because it may be useful. We can scarcely conceive a book more calculated to interest and instruct the unlearned folk of its day than the "*Handlyng Synne*," and we cannot doubt that it did in its time a useful work. The character of the poem will, however, best be judged from particular instances.²

Under the head of the First Commandment we get some curious particulars about witchcraft.

* "*Zyf you yn swerde, other³ yn bacyn
Any chylde madyst loke thereyn,*

¹ The error of attributing this poem to Grostête still appears in Mr. Luard's late edition of Grostête's Letters, published by the Master of the Rolls.

² In the quotations made those passages in which Mannyng closely follows his French original are marked *; those in which he writes his own thoughts thus †.

³ Or.

Or yn thumbe, or yn cristal—
 Wycchecraft men clepen hyt alle—
 Beleve noght yn the pyys¹ chattering
 Hyt ys no trouthe, but fals belevyng.
 Many beleven yn the pye,
 Whan she comth lowe or hye
 Cheteryng, and hath no reste,
 Than, say they, we shall have geste.
 Many one trowyn on here wyllys,
 And many tymes the pye them gyllys.
 Also ys metyng on the morwe²
 When thou shalt go to bye or to borwe;
 Zyf than thy erende spede ne sette,
 Than wylt thou curse hym that thou mette—
 Of hancel³ Y can no skylle also,
 Hyt ys nongt to beleve tharto. . . .
 Beleve nongt moche yn no dremys,
 For many be nat but gleteryng glemys
 On syxe maners may a man mete,
 Sum beyn to beleve, sum beyn to lete.” (351—388.)

Here is a relic of the old heathen superstition of the Fates :—

* “ Zyf thou trowest or undyrstondys
 That thre sustren⁴ ben shapandys⁵
 And comun there the chylde ys bore
 And shapen hyt wele or evel before—
 Swyche beleve thou shuldest nat werche
 Agens the beleve of holy Cherche.
 Ther ys no shapper but God Almyght
 That yn the Vyrgyne Mary lygt.” (571—580.)

The poem, as has been pointed out, is addressed to the laity, and the faults and vices of both rich and poor are unsparingly lashed therein. One of the crying sins of the former was, a terrible habit of profane swearing. Under the *second* Commandment (the true second being as usual dropped out of the Decalogue) a strong condemnation of the evil language used by the gentry is given :—

* “ Zyf thou were ever so fole hardy
 So swere grete othys grysly,
 As we feyls do alle day
 Dysmembre JESU alle that we may.
 Gentyl men for grete gentry
 Wene that grete othys beyn curtesy;
 Notheles, blode, fete and ygne,⁶
 They scorne JESU and upbreyde Hys pyne—

¹ Magpie.

² Morning.

³ Luck, in the first thing that happens in the day.

⁴ Sisters.

⁵ Shapers or fashioners of Destiny.

⁶ Eyes.

Of Hys woundys He hath upbreyde
 Oure shame hyt ys that yt ys seyde—
 Hys flesche, Hys blode He shedde for the,
 Woundys He suffred to make thee fre,
 So mochyl ys oure shame the more
 That we eft pyne Hym so sore." (665—680.)

Illustrate and enforce the lesson against swearing a tale is
 y Manning which does not appear in the French poem.
 rgin appears to a rich man who was a great swearer, carry-
 r Child all bloody, disfigured, and maimed, and tells him
 : has made Him so by his oaths. On this he repents, and
 es to give up swearing.

"The thridde Commaundement yn oure lay
 Ys holde weyl thyss holyday,
 And come blelyche¹ to the servyse
 Whan Holy Chyrche settyth asyse.
 † Of all the festys that yn holy Church are,
 Holy Sunday men oghte to spare.
 Holy Sunday ys before all fre,
 That evere zyt were or evere shal be.
 For the Pope may thurghe hys powere
 Turne the halydays in the yere
 How as he wyl, at his owne wyl;
 But the Sunday shal stonde styl.
 Tharfore the Sunday specyally
 Ys hiest to halew and most wurthy.
 And that day thou owest and shal
 For to here thy servyse al;
 Matyns, messe here to rede or syngg
 Every dey² to the endyngg;
 Weyte thy tyme and be not the last
 To come whan holy watyr ys cast.
 Come fyrst to matyns syf that thou may
 For hyt ys Goddys owne day." (801—828.)

The thorough English reverence for the Sunday displayed here
 comes out again with great vigour in another part of the poem,
 when under the head of the "Sin of Sloth," the Canon censures
 n severe terms the way in which the rich man too often spends
 his Sunday. The rich man will not trouble himself to hear ma-
 ins. He lies lazily in bed, saying that it will be sufficient for him
 o hear mass. The time for the second service comes, and he is
 alled. Then he grumbles from his bed

* "What devyl! why hath the prest swyche hy?³
 Byd hym that he abyde algate,
 Hym dar not syng zyt over late." (4285.)

¹ Rotiques.

² Part.

³ Haste.

At last he gets to church, but when there he is not very devout his demeanour.

† “ And when he cometh unto the messe
There behoveth hym hys here¹ dresse,
Ful fewe bedys are yn hys mouthe,
He usyth none, they are uncouth; ;
And zyf a frere cum for to preche,
Of a dynere were bettyr speche;
Than seyth he, ‘God shall alle save,
Do wel, wel shalt thou have.’ ” (4294—4302.)

Who can fail to see that the rich man’s favourite *resumé* of divinity in the fourteenth century is very like the creed of the respectable squire or merchant of the nineteenth century? The same worthy’s objection to the appearance of the preaching friar in the pulpit, is also very like the strong antipathy of his modern antitype to the earnest preacher pressing the Offertory. But our poet is by no means inclined to spare the comfortable sinner. Of his short and easy creed he says :

† “ Certys that ys nat ynow
For he doth no thing to prow,²
But zyf he wulde lestene the frere,
To do weyl than mygt he lere.”³ (4303—4306.)

Having at last got back from church, and done with the friar, the squire demands if dinner be ready. If it be not, he has “chesse and tables” to while away the time, and at these will play till noon. Then again he returns to his games in the afternoon, wasting his time at these vain amusements and caring nothing for God’s service.

† “ He ys no more Cristyn man,
Than who so kallyth a blak oxe swan.” (4321—2.)

The zeal of the Canon for the due observance of Sunday leads him also to contend for the restoration of the ancient custom of the Saturday half-holiday, a curious anticipation of modern time

† “ Sum tyme hyt was wont to be down,
To halewe the Satyrday at the noun,
Namlyche yn Inglonde.
When that custome was wont to be
Than was grace and grete plente.
The Saturday ys specyally
Ordeynede to wurschyp oure Ladye,
And that for a grete resun :
Whan Jhesu deyde thurghe passynn,

¹ Hair.

² Profit.

³ Learn.

Hys dyscyplys doutede echoun
 Whether He shulde ryse or noun ;¹
 But Hys Modyr Vyrgyne Marie,
 She bare the beleve up stedfastly
 Fro the Fryday at the noun
 Till alle the Saturday was doun." (845—866.)

Under the head of the "Fifth Commandment," which is the fourth in Robert Mannyng's Decalogue, the only characteristic remark to be noted is the exception which he declares to hold good against the claims of parental obedience.

- * "To relygyun thou mayst go
 Wythoute cunseyll of any mo :
 And to holy Land zyf thou have hyt hettes²
 Syb ne unayb may hyt lette." (1194—7.)

The Seventh Commandment furnishes, as might be expected, plenty of matter to the moralizer. The didactic part is illustrated and supported by two stories, one of them exceedingly silly, but the other not only very much to the point, but also very important in our survey of the views and opinions of the Gilbertine Canon, inasmuch as it shows that he, or at any rate his French original, was fully awake to the value of a good wife. An "Abbot of great renoun" prays that he may be told "who in heaven shall be his pere," he is told

- * "Ther beth twey wymmen yn a cyté,
 Of so moche boneryté,
 That al the penaunce that thou mayst do
 Ne may nat reche here godenes to." (1926—9.)

The abbot (S. Macaire) at once sets off in his travels to find these women, and discover in what their goodness consists. He comes to their city, and is hospitably entertained at the house where the two ladies, who had married two brothers, lived together. He asks their secret, and they tell him that they have "no holynesse," but perfect love and charity to their husbands.

- * "To twey brethryn we weddyde are,
 A passyde be twenty yere,
 And we to-gedyr have lyvyde here
 That nevere wyth them were we onys wrothe,
 Ne they wyth us that weddyde us bothe.
 Yn relygyun we wulde us do ;
 Oure husbondys graunte nat thar-to,
 Zyt have we levere leve our wille,
 Than oure husbondys greve wyth ylle." (1963—73.)

The abbot goes back to his abbey rejoicing that he has found such women. In order however that the sex may not too much glorify

¹ Not.

² If thou hast promised or vowed it.

itself at this high commendation, the English poet adds a p which is not in his French original, and in which he aims a blow at the sharp tongues and tempers of the English of his time.

† "God wulde hyt were now so here,
So meke wymmen of so fayre manere,
But of outhen men mowe fynde
Wymmen yn wedlak ryght on-kynde,
That for a game wurde yn veyn,
They wyl gyve forty ageyn." (1991—2001.)

In discussing the command against stealing, our author strong marks of a sturdy, independent spirit, ready to resist the actions and tyrannies of unjust lords, which no doubt were a scourge to the poor in his day. Often indeed was the me Churchman a tower of strength and defence to the poor oppressed peasant against a lawless and harsh master. Wielding a power which the stoutest sooner or later quailed, he was able to thrash the shield of holy Church before the down-trodden vassal, and to persecuting seignior some plain truths, such as Robert Manning gives utterance to when he says

† "Thoghe God have zeve the seynorye
He gaf hym no leve to do robberye;
For God hath ordeynede al mennys state
How to lyve and yn what gate:
And He evermore taketh venaunce
Of lordys for swych mischaunce,
For swych robbery that they make,
That ofte of the poure men take." (2207—20.)

And again, in discussing the seven deadly sins,

† "LORDE, how shul these robbers fare,
That the pore pepyl pelyn ful bare—
Erles, knyghtes and barouns,
And outhen lordynges of tounnes,
Justyses, shryves and baylyvys,
That the lawes alle to-ryves,
And the pore men alle to-pyle,
To ryche men do they but as they wylle." (6790—

A sad picture of the state of the country under Edward here drawn. And a no less wretched one of the prevailing sin is to be found under the Tenth Commandment:

† "The Tenthe Comaundement ys by thy lyfe
Coveyte nat thy negheburs wyfe;
And thys ys now a comun synne
That many one fallen ynne,

For almost hyt ys every-whore
 A gentyl man hath a wyfe and a hore—
 And wyves have now comunly
 Here husbondys and a ludby." (2926—33.)

The discussion of the seven deadly sins introduces us to many curious particulars of life and thought at the beginning of the fourteenth century. Then, as probably at all times, pride in dress was a prevailing sin, and it seems that the ladies were specially liable to vanity in the dressing of their hair. Hence they are told,

* "Be nat proude of thy croket¹
 Yn the cherche to tyfe and set,
 At home mayst thou thy croket werche,
 And nat at thy messe yn the cherche." (3208—11.)

The poet however acknowledges that he is obliged to speak with reserve in this matter.

† "Of proude wymmen wulde Y telle,
 But they are so wrothe and felle." (3218—9.)

Yet his conscience obliges him to say something, though evidently in fear and trembling.

† "Of ladyys wulde Y leve my sawe,
 But Y dar nat for Gonnys awe,
 Of them behoveth to sey sumdeyl,
 Yn what poyntes they do nat weyl." (3236—9.)

He then proceeds to tell a fearful story of a proud lady, who was very much devoted to tiring her head, and who was condemned to torment in the next world for her vanity. But his censures on love of dress are not confined to the ladies. He has something also to say against the "berdede buckys."

† "That leve crystyn mennys alyse,
 And haunte alle the newe gyse." (3214—5.)

And not only against the fast laymen, but also against the Clergy, for their sins in this matter. A tale is told of a clerk that loved a "cote of pride," and was burned to ashes for his vanity.

* "And a clerk ys moche for to blame,
 That bryngeth hymself in foule fame—
 Clerk ordeynede yn dignyte,
 That haunteth swyche jolyté." (3400—3.)

¹ Chaplet, head-dress.

It seems that some of the Clergy were so revolutionary in the views as to object to the tonsure, and to insist on dressing themselves like laymen. Altogether things were in a bad condition : regards dress. The women with their trailing dresses and saffro wimples, the knights with the "new guise," the Clergy with the lay tastes,—everything was confused. Now this account accords very strikingly with two other sketches of about the same period. In a poem (published by the Percy Society) on the times of Edward II., we are told that

"Knytes schuld were clothes
 Ischape in dewe manere,
 As his order wold aske,
 As wel as schuld a frere;
 Now thei beth disgysed
 So diverselych idight,
 Than no man may knowe
 A minstrel from a knygt wel ny."

And Richard Rolle, of Hampole, in his "Prick of Conscience,"

"Of bathe ther worldes gret outrage we se,
 In pompe, and pride, and vanité;
 In selcouthe maners and sere degyse
 That now es used of many wyse.
 In worldis havyng and beryng
 In vayn apparail and in weryng,
 That tas over mykel vain costage,
 And tornes al until outrage,
 For swilk degises, and swilk maners
 Als yhong men now hauntes and lere,
 And ilk day es comonly sen
 Byfor this tyme ne has noght ben."¹

Robert Mannyng would thus seem not to have been singular in denouncing his own time as especially peccant in the matter of dress. Perhaps indeed there was a vein of somewhat extra asceticism in the Canon's view: we find him declaiming with great vigour against both tournaments and miracle-plays. In the first he proves,

"Sevene points of dedly synne," (4577.)

And of the other he writes,

* "For myracles zyf thou begynne
 Hyt ys a gaderyng, a syghte of synne;
 He may yn the cherche thurghe thys resun
 Play the Resurreccyun.
 And he may play wythoutyn plyghte,
 Howe Gode was borne yn Zole nyghte,

¹ Preface to *Prick of Conscience* (Philol. Soc.) p. 29.

Zyf thou do hyt yn weyys or grevys,¹
A syghte of synne truly hyt semys." (4642—55.)

The exhortations against usury and unjust dealing in the poem are frequent, and under this head a very curious story is told of one Pers, a usurer, who was reclaimed from his wicked ways and became a striking example of sanctity. A poor beggar laid his fellows a wager that he would get something out of Miser Pers, "be he never so gryl or grym." He asks Pers for charity just as an ass-load of bread is come to his house. Pers stoops for a stone, but as he cannot find one flings a loaf at the beggar, with which the latter wins his wager. Pers has a vision of the judgment of his evil deeds, and against all his evil ones this single loaf makes even balance. He reflects on this, and becomes meek and kind. A poor man comes to him naked, Pers puts his kirtle on him, and the man goes away and sells it. Pers grieves greatly, but is comforted by a fair dream; he sees God clad in his kirtle, and God says, that as it was given to the poor it was given to Him. On waking Pers says,

"Blessyde be alle poré men,
For God Almyghty loveth them." (5741—2.)

He bestows his goods on the poor, and gives his notary ten pounds to sell him into bondage. The notary takes him to a church, sells him to a reduced rich man, Yole, and gives the ten pounds to the poor.

Pers "sweles" pots and dishes, and bears the bullying of his mates most meekly. Through him his master prospers, and offers to free him. Pers refuses; soon after some of his former acquaintance being at his master's house, recognise him. He hears them and runs away, miraculously causing the deaf and dumb porter to hear and speak. He is sought but cannot be found, as He who took Enoch and Elijah took Pers through His mercy to rest without end. The "Cambridgeshire Miser-Parson," and the "Kesteven Executors" are also good stories, directed against the sins of covetousness and unfair dealing. The Canon of Sempringham is by no means inclined to spare the Clergy, and is almost as severe upon them as the author of "Piers Plowman." He asks with much force

"What ys hyt worthe to preche in cherche,
Whan mea yn dede wyl nat werche?" (6944.)

Priests' wives are of course the objects of his bitter attacks, and under this head he tells a horrible story, in which his favourite agency of grim devils carrying off the corpse of the unhappy sinner is largely made use of. Here and there we glean from the poem some very curious particulars as to the domestic and social

¹ Roads, or churchyards.

habits of the time. Two meals a day he considers to be the proper allowance for adults; young children may have three meals.

- * "For sum of them wex ful tyte,¹
Tharfore ys more there appetyte." (7334.)

But "rere," or late suppers are an especial offence in the eyes of the moralist.

- † "Rere sopers yn pryvyté
Wyth glotonye echone they be,
And thyr ys moche waste ynne
And gadryng of outhr synne;
Also falle men yn plyghte,
That sytte up the Thursday at nyghte,
And overlong ete flesshe and drunke,
Aftyr that mydnyght ys runge;
Such etynge they shul sore abeye,
But they amende them are they deye,
The Fryday nyghte ys—thys shalt thou leve—
Aftyr the Thursday at eve.
As Y have tolde of rere sopers,
The same falleth of erly dyners:
Dyners are oute of skyl and resun,
On the Sunday or hye messe be doun,
Thoghe thou have haste, here zyt a messe
Al holy, and no lesse,
And nat symple a sakare;²
Here thy messe or thou dyne,
Zyf thou do nat elles ys yt pyne." (7260—7311.)

Lords who "have a priest at will," do very wrong if they do not hear mass every morning, and priests are guilty of a grievous sin of gluttony if they run away to attend some lord's banquet, leaving their "messe on the auter."

After discussing the "Seven Deadly Sins," Robert Mannyng next addresses himself to the sin of sacrilege.

- "Mow we nat weyl werche
Zyf we forget holy Cherche,
Holy Cherche oure modyr dere
Of here shul we telle zow here." (8589—92.)

Some of those who come under censure in this matter are those pugnacious monks, "who for the maystry wyl gladly smyte."

- * "They oghe to be suffrable and meke
And no foly on outhr men seke;
Hys tung shulde be hys fauchoun,
Hys strokes shulde be hys orysun,

¹ Grow full quick.

² The consecration part of the mass.

Zyf any be yn foly stoute
Holde yn cloystre and com nat out." (8641—6.)

Another class of clerical malefactors who are guilty of the sin of *sacrilege* are those priests who let cattle feed in their churchyard. *Burying* promiscuously in churches for the sake of getting high *fees* is another form of sacrilege.

† "Hyt ys defendede on the decre
That none yn cherche shal beryede be,
But Bysshop or Abbot of relygyun,
Or Prest that ys of gode renoun." (8719—22.)

Holy church is defiled by having any of evil life buried inside the walls. In illustration of this a story is told of one Valentine, a "playtour" of the Church at Milan, who was dragged out of his tomb by devils. Another form which sacrilege assumes is inordinate pride in tomb-stones. A very curious development of this vice is the practice which is strongly censured, of laymen standing in the chancel among the clergy when they are singing the service. And it seems that not only men, but even women, were guilty of this effrontery. Upon which we have a tale of S. John Chrysostom, and his deacon who was attracted by the sight of a beautiful lady when serving at mass; of which the saint becoming aware by an inspiration, delivered him by bringing him to instant confession.

Another curious illustration of the sin of sacrilege is the holding law courts in churches.—

† "Also yt ys vyllanye to werche
A lewede man to plete¹ yn cherche,
Ne sysours oghte nat to enquere
Of felonye ne of thefte there." (8911—18.)

The sin of carolling in the churchyard during service time is introduced as the prologue to a remarkable story, which represents a band of carollers condemned to dance together for twelve months as a punishment for their sacrilege, and then to go about hopping singly ever afterwards. The more ordinary offence of "jangling" or chattering in church is illustrated by a story of so droll a character that we cannot forbear quoting it:—

† "An holy man hys messe songe,
And at the messe whan tyme fel
The dekene to rede the Gospel
Yn hys redyng noun whyst why
He loghe a grete lagheter on hy * * *
The dekene told the Prest how yt felle
There to laghe yn hys Gospel.

¹ Plead.

'As Y redde that yche tyde
 Twey wymmen janglede there beayde;
 Betwyx hem to Y sagh a fende
 Wyth penne and parchemen yn hende
 And wrote alle that ever they spake
 Pryvyly behynde there bake.
 Whan hys rolle was wryte alle ful
 To drawe hyt oute he gan to pul;
 Wyth hys tethe he gan to drawe,
 And harde for to tugge and guawe
 That hys rolle to-braste¹ and rofe
 And hys hede agens the walle drofe,
 So harde and so ferly sore
 When hys parchemen was no more.
 Whan Y sagh that Y lete so gode
 Y brast on lagheter there Y stode,
 That he so moche sorow hadde
 As hys wrytyng was alle to-fade,
 And when he parceyvede that Y wyste
 He al to-drofe hyt wyth hys fyste,
 And went away alle for shame;
 Tharfore Y loghe and hadde gode game.' " (9263—99.)

It would thus seem that the extreme loquacity of these ladies gave them an advantage over less vigorous talkers, and the large amount of their "jangling" prevented any record being taken of it. Under this head of sacrilege an attack is also made on "parsons' heirs" and "parsons' cosins," by whom, it is insinuated, the goods of Holy Church are unfairly appropriated. It is observable, that on this head Robert of Brunne is much more full than William of Waddington, scarce any of the matter above alluded to being found in the French original. Whether it was that the Englishmen for whom Mannyng wrote were specially addicted to the sin of irreverence in holy things, or whether it was the habit of his own mind especially to magnify the grace of veneration, it certainly appears to have been carefully worked out by him into all its ramifications. From sacrilege the poet passes on to the seven Sacraments of Holy Church, in treating of which some curious points occur. In baptism the infants are said to be "noyled with creme," and the ignorance of midwives in wrongly performing the ceremony is complained of. Confirmation is carefully explained not to be a necessary supplement of baptism, but "after chrystenyng gode sekernesse." The sacrament of the altar is treated at some length, and the "five properties" of the "vble" or consecrated wafer are insisted on. These are the same which are expressed in the Latin distich,—

"Candida, triticea, tenuis, non magna, rotunda,
 Expers frumenti, non mixta sit hostia Christi."

¹ Broke in pieces.

A profusion of stories is given us to illustrate the power of masses to deliver souls out of purgatory, but the most characteristic tale that is told under this head is one which relates how a miner, buried by a fall of earth, was kept alive and well for a whole year, because his wife duly offered every day some loaves and a pitcher of wine for the good of his soul.

In treating of the sacrament of Orders, a very poor account is given of the clergy.

"Lytyl kan lasse the lewede man
Than some of these prestes kan.
Who gyven them more to worldly thyng
Than prestes do for alle there prechyng?
What vayleth to understonde the lettyr
And hys lyfe be never the bettyr?" (10966—73.)

Of Matrimony the Canon has not much to say, evidently regarding it rather as a necessary evil than in any other light; but on Shrift he is very diffuse, giving us at length the twelve points or requisites of a good confession, and the twelve graces which it confers. But before he begins this subject he offers a solemn thanksgiving that he has been able to accomplish so much.

† "Jesu Y thanke the of thy grace,
That hast lent me wyt ande space,
Thys yn Englys for to drawe,
As holy men have seyde yn sawe,¹
For lewede men hyt may avayle,
For them Y toke thys travayle." (11292—5.)

Then he proceeds to discuss Shrift and its requisites. First; that it be voluntary. Second; that it be done without delay. Third; that it be open. Fourth; done in meekness. Fifth; without holding back anything. Sixth; in sorrow. Seventh; made to one who has wisdom.

† "Of synne who so vyl hym lese,
A wyse shryftfadyr behoveth hym chese,
Ane that may bynde ande unbynde
Swyche a man behoveth hym fynde,
A prest that ys no clergie yne,
How can he weyl distyncte thy synne?
But now over alle se we mowne,²
An holy-watyr clerke of a tounne,
That lytyl hath lernede yn hys lyfe,
He ys ordeynede a prest to shryve—
He may lyve as a gode man
Thoghe he lytyl clergie kan,
But for to preche or here shryfte,
Of clergie behoveth hym sum thryfte." (11587—604.)

¹ Said in their doctrine.

² Everywhere must we see.

The eighth requisite of Shrift is, that it shall be all of oneself, not implicating others. The ninth; that it shall neither be less nor more than the sin committed. The tenth; that the sin confessed shall be forsaken. The eleventh; that there shall be submission to the penance enjoined. The twelfth; that it shall be made wholly to one confessor. Then follow the twelve graces which a wholesome and complete Shrift made after the pattern thus sketched out confers. The poem concludes with a story of how the devil once came to confession, but because he had no repentance could not be absolved. From which is drawn the wholesome moral that Shrift saves not without repentance, and the prayer,—

“GODE graunte us alle us self to zeme,
And yn oure shryfte Jesu to queme.”

The glossary appended to the poem, as edited by Mr. Furnivall for the Roxburghe Club, is somewhat too meagre for the ordinary reader, and many of the unusual words are left unexplained. The language, however, as will be seen from the specimens quoted, is for the most part more easy than might be expected from its early date. Robert Mannyng tells us in several places that he can only write simple English such as would be understood by unlettered folk. He wrote—

“Not for the lelid, bot for the lewede,
For tho that in this land wonne,
That no Latyn no Frankys conne.”

Prologue to Langtoft's Chronicle.

“In symple speche as I couthe,
That is lightest in mannes mouthe,
I mad nought for no disours,
Ne for no seggers, no harpours,
Bot for the luf of symple menne,
That strange Inglis canne not kenne.
I made it not for to be praysed,
Bot that the lewede menne were aysed.”—*Ib.*

Other more ambitious poets had composed their verses—

“In so quainte Inglis,
That many one wate not what it is,
But forsothe I couth nought,
So strange Inglis as thai wrought.”

For this plainness of speech he had been scorned by some, but he will follow out his purpose,

“For loof of the lewed man,”

and all the reward that he desires for his “makyng” is “gude prayer when ye it rede.” We must, at any rate, respect the mo-

tives of the good Canon even if we do not admire his rhymes. The Handlyng Synne will not indeed bear a comparison with the visions of Piers Plowman for power and original thought, but, nevertheless, it has considerable merit of its own; and we cannot doubt that both the English adaptation and the French original were useful in their day to many a plain countryman, who had not sufficient of the critical faculty to question the credibility of the stories told, but who could understand and appreciate the strong denunciations of familiar vices and the earnest exhortations to good living which the poems contain.

ECCE HOMO.

Ecce Homo. A Survey of the Life and Work of Jesus Christ
Second Edition. London and Cambridge: Macmillan and Co.
1866.

WE have no hesitation in stating our conviction that this is the most dangerous book of our day; and this for two reasons, both because of its *matter* and of its *manner*. To take the more solid reason first: What is the subject of which our author treats, and what is the conclusion which he leaves on our minds when we have read his treatise?

The real subject that underlies the vagueness of his title is the Person of our LORD, and the only "conclusion" which he gives us, when we analyze that last chapter of his work which he calls such, is that the Founder of Christianity must have been a remarkable Man. Yes, this new defender of the faith leaves us, after all his florid language and impassioned argument, still in the cold embrace of a dreary Socinianism!

But it is not only because we consider that "Ecce Homo" thus impugns the Divinity of CHRIST, the central Article of our Creed, that we adjudge it to be a more dangerous book than other modern heretical works, such as "Essays and Reviews," or Dr. Colenso's "Pentateuch," which merely attack, as it were, the outposts of Christianity; it is not only on account of its *matter*, as we said, but also from a consideration of its *manner* that we deplore its publication. For we recognize in its appearance the beginning of a new era of theological controversy in England; we take this characteristic book to be but the first wave which indicates the setting in of a tide of profane criticism upon the nature of our Blessed LORD. For although the author of "Ecce Homo" has evidently himself too refined a taste to allow himself to write profanely about religion, yet he will doubtless be shocked to find following him

along the path of free discussion which he has opened out towards the mysteries of Divinity, a crowd of imitators, who will handle these same sacred topics with a coarse unscrupulousness, an unrefined freedom which we tremble to contemplate, and which will be even to him intolerably offensive. The ex-Bishop of Natal for instance, has already professed his willingness to deal with the New Testament as he has dealt with the Old, and he may perhaps be emboldened by the interest which has been excited by this latest attempt to solve the problem of Christianity, to apply *his* method to its elucidations.

Yet we confess that we should have regarded a cold calculating treatise from the author of the "Manual of Arithmetic" with more revulsion perhaps, yet for that very reason with less apprehension than the poetical fragment, the interesting gushing essay, the mysterious anonymous revelation of a personal heart-struggle which has not only stimulated the curiosity and occupied the thoughts of the theological and literary men of our Universities, but has also excited the imagination and aroused the sympathies of the educated circle of London society, nay, has even attracted the notice of the silly world, so that the awful title of the book of the day has been a familiar word in the mouths of fashionable frequenters of Lenten dinner parties.

But we must proceed from this passing notice of its superficial popularity to a more exact examination of the pretensions of the book as a theological treatise. The author himself, in his preface, proclaims the benefit which he conceives the publication of what he tells us had been his own experience, may be to the religious or the irreligious world. In that preface which has so successfully baffled the curiosity of literary circles, he also tells us the unbiased attitude of mind in which his readers are to start with him in his subjective reconstruction of Christianity. We are to reconsider, he tells us, the whole subject from the beginning, and "uninfluenced by the authority of Church doctors or even apostles," are to form our conclusions, or rather are to accept those which the great-unknown has been led to form, from "a critical weighing of facts."

But it is here upon the very threshold of his argument that we presume to pause and question the trustworthiness of our guide. And, since we are unwilling at this early stage to question on our own responsibility the position of one apparently so well able to hold his own, we would remind our philosopher that one of the greatest thinkers of the day has pronounced the position, which he claims as the foundation, the starting point of his whole discussion, to be an utterly untenable one. For it is essential to such an examination of theology as he professes to have made that the mind of the critic should be a *blank*.

"But in truth, the mind never can resemble a blank paper, in its freedom from impressions and prejudices. Infidelity is a positive, not negative state; it is a state of profaneness, pride, and selfishness; and he who believes a little, but encompasses that little with the inventions of men, is undeniably in a better state than he who blots out from his mind both the human inventions and the portion of truth which was concealed in them."—*Newman's Ariana*, p. 50.

Since then we deny with Dr. Newman the *à priori* emptiness of our intelligent author's mind, we may fairly proceed to speculate upon the dispositions and expectations which he seems to bring to bear upon that problem, the (partial) solution of which he proposes to lay before us. And surely it is impossible while reading his fascinating book not to be unconsciously informed as to the tone of the writer's mind, for his personality obtrudes itself with a painful reality from every sentence. We could as easily imagine that "In Memoriam" was excogitated from the inner consciousness of a sincere Methodist, or that "the Christian Year" was the refuse of the thoughts of an ingenious infidel, as accept the conclusion of some charitable Churchmen about the composition of "Ecce Homo," viz., that it is throughout a mere *hypothetical* statement of a view which the writer feels and knows to be a false one, and that he has merely adopted this unreal line of argument as his own to convince the sceptical world that it is a fallacious one.

If this be the mind of our author, we stand amazed at his readiness of disguise and his powers of abstraction. Yet while we sincerely rejoice, if so it be, at the adhesion of so able a champion to the cause of orthodoxy, yet we must deprecate the mode of his defence and the kind of weapons which he uses on our behalf, so that even if his *sincerity* were unimpeachable, still we deny his *judgment*; we utterly deny that it is honourable for a theological writer to throw a veil of doubtfulness around truths which he holds as undoubted, thinking thus to render them more palatable to men of a less receptive faith. This preliminary unsettling of accredited dogmas is an entirely different process to their establishment by a constructive process of argument.

But it is not only that we miss in our guide that personal conviction of the truths of Christianity which, although unexpressed, should always give by its presence the assurance of a reserved knowledge and a restrained strength; but we also think that in his eagerness to prove his sympathy for unbelievers, he has allowed himself to descend too completely to their sceptical level. We think for instance, that no one who professes to write with a religious intent is justified in degrading those terms which religion has sanctified to her own use; we think, that to classify together "poetry, the fine arts, and prophecy," as three "divine gifts;" to

speak of Christianity as one of "many revelations," is not only an inadequate, if not a false way of stating things, but also one that must create a confusion of ideas by a promiscuous use of certain terms which religion has, by common consent, been allowed to appropriate to her own special use. Again; we think that an elaborate comparison of the highest Act of Christian Worship with a "club feast" is an offence not only against literary taste but against moral reverence.

But above all things we shrink from analogies like that at page 22, where our Christian author does not scruple to compare our Divine Redeemer, in His consistent carrying out of the Eternal Will of God, to a far-sighted Liberal statesman, who is painted into the page with an air so lifelike, that it is impossible not to recognise the original of the sketch in one who, we hear, has endorsed with his high intellectual approval the book which thus throws a Divine halo round his politics. We deprecate, we repeat, such familiarity of analogy in theological writing; for those who take upon themselves to discuss theology freely should be warned that Christianity is not only a philosophy which is to be grasped with the intellect, but also a principle of practical life, which depends for its operation upon the reverence of the heart and the devotion of the feelings; so that any language, any expressions, any illustrations which, although helpful to the mind, yet tend to deaden or destroy the fresh purity of the soul's apprehensions, are no aids, but rather hindrances, to that knowledge of God, which is the one absolute object of all religion.

Thus, then, we deny to our would-be impartial critic the starting point which he claims, viz., a purely subjective view of history. We consider, also, that he shows, by the tone that pervades his book and by his style of writing, that he *does* start with an objective view of Christianity, which is *not* the orthodox view.

It will be interesting next to inquire if this view, which he has made so completely his own that he appears to imagine he has himself evolved it without external critical aid from his own acute consciousness, can be traced to any objective source. We answer readily that it *can*; that the theological writings of Germany are that source.

This might be proved in detail, but it may be sufficient to give one proof, as follows:—There is an expression which runs throughout the length and breadth of the pages, and indeed gives the keynote to the philosophy of the treatise—the expression, the "plan" of JESUS. Now this very term, which we have heard re-echoed by simple English readers as so charmingly novel, is only too familiar to those of us who have had occasion to deal with the sceptical school of German writers.

We presume to deny, then, to this much-admired book not only

its spiritual value as an aid to faith, but also its literary merit as an original production. At least it is not original in its matter, its thoughts, and line of argument;—we cannot deny to our countryman that which he has borrowed from no foreigner, an unmistakable English way of putting things, a certain manly vigour of language, which we recognise with an honest pride as all our own. Yet even here, while we admire, we tremble, lest this power of assimilating imparted ideas, and this facility of expressing the thoughts thus made his own in language which is at once intelligible to his own people, may not prove, in the hands of an unsound, an unscrupulous writer, a bane to his country, if he thinks fit to use his talent for the purpose of naturalizing here the refuse of German theology.

But we have a further complaint to make against our countryman. It is not only that he deluded us when he promised a book of original English thought, since we discover his view of CHRIST to be an old ideal, derived from the many "Christologies" of Germany, and only freshened up by being put into an attractive English dress. We not only thus complain of what he gives us, but also at the way in which he gives it; we are not (to speak as cold critics) satisfied with his matter, and we are, moreover, affronted at his manner. In the name of free criticism we protest against our free critic's dogmatism of negation. We object as Englishmen to be fed against our will with German food. If such nourishment seems good to the writer of "Ecce Homo," let him take it; he knows his own constitution better than we do: but we must protest against the arbitrary manner in which the opinions which he has thus assimilated are forced upon his readers, as if they were axiomatic truths.

Yet this is only the old fact cropping out, that, as in the political world democracy soon proves itself to be the grossest tyranny, no rule to be misrule, and abolition of law the most cruel infringement of the liberty of the subject; so in religion there are no dogmatists more unreasonable than those who would deny all existing dogmas, since they invariably substitute for the doctrine of the Catholic Church their own individual opinions, which they obtrude and force upon their followers with a calm *ipse dixit*.

To illustrate our meaning by instances of such personal dogmatism in this our critic during the construction of his subjective scheme of Christianity, we will take first his peculiar conception of a scene in Gospel history on which most commentators for many reasons have declined to enlarge,—but not so our latest Anglican divine. We allude to the outward demeanour and attitude of mind which he arbitrarily attributes to our LORD, when the woman taken in adultery was brought before Him. *Who*, we ask, saw the "burning blush of shame" on the face of the Redeemer, as He

stooped to hide His confusion by writing on the ground? *Who*, we still more peremptorily ask, penetrated into the depths of that Redeemer's Mind, and has recorded (for the author of "Ecce Homo") that He was, at this crisis in His life of temptation, "seized with an intolerable sense of shame, so that He could not meet the eye of the crowd or of the accusers, and perhaps at that moment least of all the woman?" We must here at least concede to our author the miserable merit of an original handling of an event so mysterious. Yet, were it not for the fact that our critic has selected this one passage of S. John to illustrate his humanitarian theories, we might imagine that he had gathered his historical facts solely from the synoptical Evangelists, without any knowledge of the testimony of that Evangelist who wrote to declare the Divinity underlying the Person and the teaching and acts of CHRIST. We can conceive how a theologian, starting with an *à priori* conviction that Pilate's introduction of our SAVIOUR to the Jews is a sufficient description of His Person to satisfy Christians, should (not, perhaps, perversely, but unconsciously) keep the words of the fourth gospel in the background of his thoughts; this implicit denial of the witness of S. John we could comprehend, though not justify; but we can hardly recognise the candour of a writer who, with the fourth, eighth, and tenth chapters of S. John before him as integral parts of the material from which he has to form a biography, could state absolutely that CHRIST wished "humanity to be measured precisely by His stature," and that He "delighted to call Himself the Son of Man."

With the hope that, ere our unknown author gives to a greedy world the second part of his treatise, he will have assimilated to his mind the beloved Apostle's statements as to the nature of his LORD, we take leave of "Ecce Homo" and its author.

The book which this able writer has left with us is meaningless, as a life of CHRIST. It is not even what it with some modesty professes to be—a "fragment" of such a work. What it presents to us is not our dear LORD; it is a mere ideal man of man's own construction, a strange deification of humanity, a new demigod added to the pantheon.

For *us* there still remains but One to Whom we cling, "JESUS CHRIST, the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever," and of Whom we hold with the Church Catholic of many centuries, that "God and Man is One CHRIST."

CANON OAKELEY ON THE EIRENICON.

The leading Topics of Dr. Pusey's recent Work reviewed, in a Letter addressed (by permission,) to the Most Rev. H. E. Manning, D.D. By the Very Rev. FREDERIC OAKELEY, M.A. London: Longmans, Green and Co. 1866. 8vo. Pp. 175.

WHEN we have fairly sifted out the meaning from Canon Oakeley's long and intricate sentences; when we have mastered his ideas, which are wrapped up in such eminently un-Saxon English; and, lastly, when we have fully realised the propositions which are contained in soft and somewhat smooth definitions of dogma; we find ourselves put wholly out of court. We have no ground for appeal of any kind. Our Church is undogmatic, therefore no "bulwark against infidelity;" our Ritual is described as being "mimicries of Catholic ceremonial," which are only useful to familiarise men's minds with "a type of worship, which had been totally obliterated." The reality of the rites and ceremonies of the Anglican Church is not only denied, but such rites are spoken of as being "most injurious to those who delight in them, by leading them to confound the outward show with the true spirit of Catholicity;" they lead to a system of equivocation and compromise, highly prejudicial to the moral sense; their revival causing the formation of "a considerable body of the Clergy who are constantly seeking to hoodwink their Bishops, who are themselves not very impatient of the process." The restoration to the Anglican Church of her lawful vestments and "ceremonial religion," is "not only not a gain but a distinct and conspicuous evil." Of course all attempts at unity with such a Church must end in discomfiture. The phrase "corporate reunion will not bear sifting." The name of our Church is "indeterminate, whether Established, Anglo-Catholic, National, or Protestant." "The collective body of its Bishops represents nothing but the principle of passive disunion." "Who is to be the spokesman of such a body, the representative of such a polity, the ambassador of such a court?" No religious treaty could be formed which did not admit of these two propositions. "The one is that which vests the prerogative of infallibility absolutely in the person of the Holy Father speaking *ex cathedra*; the other that which requires as the condition of it, the subsequent acceptance, at least tacit, of his decrees by a collective episcopate in communion with Rome."

Canon Oakeley with considerable power applies these tests to the dogmatic decree upon the Immaculate Conception. The notion of a Catholic *minimum* and an Anglican *maximum* is thus treated of. "To suppose that a substantial religious compound could be

formed out of the weakest elements of Catholic and the strongest Anglican truth is to overlook the ethical bearings of doctrine, and to reduce the subject to the unreal form of a mere question of intellectual assent to certain barren articles of faith. We ought rather to look at the matter in the concrete, and to imagine, if it be possible, the character of a *minimum* Catholic, engrafted on that of a *maximum* Anglican." Some of the marks of this "*minimum* Catholic" are stated, which are indeed but calculated to raise a smile. He "considers belief to be a burden, not a privilege." He is "more sensitive to the rights of the Queen and Constitution than of the Pope;" he "prefers mixed to exclusive education." "He abhors the Irish as a dreamy unpractical people, taking little or no account of their faith and piety." If Canon Oakeley could, or would only tell us to what practical good the Irish mind could be turned, he might fairly be reckoned amongst the greatest of our national benefactors. Personally Canon Oakeley may be taken as a notable example of the *maximum Catholic*; nay, if it were possible to exceed a superlative, to form a *super-maximum Catholic*, it would but faintly represent his abject submission to the grosser Ultramontane developments of the Roman Catholic Church. To take one case. Dr. Newman (Letter to Dr. Pusey, pp. 113—118,) states that the Holy See has several times interfered to prevent the devotion to the Virgin Mary running into superstition; and that he recollects hearing in Gregory XVI.'s time, "of measures taken against the shocking notion that the Blessed Mary is present in the Holy Eucharist, in the sense in which our LORD is present." Dr. Newman approves of, and quotes Raynaud to this effect: "Nor is that honour of the Deipara to be offered, viz., that the elements of the Body of CHRIST, which the Blessed Virgin supplied to it, remain perpetually unaltered in CHRIST, and thereby are found also in the Eucharist . . . This solicitude for the Virgin's glory must, I consider, be discarded; since, if rightly considered, it involves an injury towards CHRIST, and such honours the Virgin loveth not. And first, dismissing philosophical bagatelles about the animation of blood, milk, &c., who can endure the proposition, that a good portion of the substance of CHRIST in the Eucharist should be worshipped with a *cultus* less than *latría*? viz., by inferior *cultus* of *hyperdulia*?"—Newman, p. 117.

Among the doctrines that seem to Dr. Newman "like a bad dream," that he "never knew of" till he read Dr. Pusey's book; and which he thinks are unknown to the vast majority of English Catholics, is included this statement about the Virgin: "That His Body and Blood in the Eucharist are truly hers and appertain to her; that as He is present and received therein, so is she present and received therein." Of this dogma which was wholly unknown to Dr. Newman and which he so very strongly condemns on hear-

ing it propounded, Canon Oakeley writes as follows: "It was the Body which He took from her that the Church ruled to be truly present in the Blessed Eucharist," (p. 39.) And again: "We may also say, and truly say, that the Blood of the Blessed Virgin was in her Son from first to last, and is, therefore, in that wondrous communication of Himself which He makes to us in the Blessed Eucharist," (p. 23.) Dr. Newman and Canon Oakeley both contradict each other; and both assert the authority of the Church, for their respective though antagonistic statements. Which of these Roman Catholic theologians are we to believe? Both call themselves English Catholics, and yet one of them is entirely ignorant of a most important dogma which the other says that the Church has "ruled." Such a contradiction as this, is completely out of place in a Church which boasts of its infallible, unanimous definition of dogma. If Canon Oakeley's statement be correct, then both Dr. Newman's Letter and Raynaud's treatise "*Diptycha Mariana*," ought to be placed on the Index forthwith.

But Canon Oakeley is very cautious of committing himself to positive statements.

We object to some of the invocations which are addressed to the Virgin; and this is our answer, "All such expressions are founded on something that corresponds with what in literary language, far below the truth, we call a poetical licence." It seems to us something monstrous to talk about "a poetical licence" in reference to very solemn acts of Divine worship: to the offering up of prayers and praises, each act of which involves the most emphatic declaration that it is possible for a mortal to make: but this consideration does not trouble the Roman Catholic, the "poetical licence" can be conveniently expanded or contracted to suit the varying capacities of his faith or feeling. "He knows or trusts that God will not misunderstand him; and gives vent to the natural feelings of his heart, without caring to protect himself at every turn from the misapprehensions of those to whom he is not equally responsible." Such liberty of worship is curious in a Church in which exact definition of dogma is made so much of: and for the soul's own good, it surely ought to determine, how it worships, and the ground of its homage. According to this statement any amount of superstition and credulity may be tolerated in the devotions of the people, provided that their priests regard such superstition and credulity as a harmless form of "poetical licence." With respect to the dogmatic teaching upon the prerogatives of the Blessed Virgin by SS. Bernard and Thomas Aquinas we read: "Objectors to the doctrine are fond of appealing to the testimony of S. Bernard and S. Thomas, but very uniformly forget to state that S. Bernard in direct terms, and S. Thomas of course by implication, make a reserve in favour of any subsequent definition of the Holy See." With the writings of S. Thomas Aquinas we are more than

ordinarily familiar, and therefore we can say with confidence that Canon Oakeley has not a shadow of a claim for his "of course by implication," &c. ; for S. Thomas Aquinas makes positive and argumentative statements of doctrine ; and these statements are directly and unequivocally opposed to the modern Roman school of theology. The two pleas which are here brought forward are ever urged by the Roman controversialists of the day : the "of course by implication" overrides the plainest definitions of doctrine ; and the most authoritative interpretations of Holy Scripture, Councils, Fathers, Doctors, are twisted to express anything and everything that the modern development theory requires for its support. True, the canons of the Councils, the commentaries of the Fathers, the definitions of the Doctors, are in words opposed to these new views : but what matters that ? they imply them of course : why ?—because they submitted themselves unreservedly to the teaching of the Holy See !

This dogma of Papal infallibility is the rock upon which modern Rome founds her new and anti-patristic system. The decree of the Pope overrides all church tradition ; it is the one great stronghold for every monstrosity in practice, and for every perversion in doctrine. "The acceptance," says Canon Oakeley, "of all our *de fide* doctrines is inconsistent with the practical rejection of the Pope's divinely ordained supremacy." "A dogmatic and infallible Church" (as we quoted before) "vests the prerogative of infallibility absolutely in the person of the Holy Father, speaking *ex cathedra*." Upon the decree of the Immaculate Conception Canon Oakeley writes :—

"But, even had this previous consultation of the Episcopate been waived altogether, the decree would have failed in no condition demanded even by the lowest theory of infallibility. For that theory calls for no limitation of the Pope's personal prerogative, save an *ex post facto* one ; and dogmatic decrees, such as that by which the errors of Jansenius are condemned, are universally accepted as adequate expressions of an infallible voice, although promulgated without ceremonial solemnity, and without any previous formal consultation of the collective Episcopate. Hence it follows, not only that the range of *de fide* doctrines is far more extensive than the terms of Dr. Pusey's claim would seem to embrace, but that he is at issue with us as to the necessary conditions of a *de fide* declaration of the Church."

And so Canon Oakeley, as we said at the beginning of this notice, puts us out of court. He does not take his stand upon the Canons of Œcumenical Councils, nor upon a consensus of Biblical interpretation, nor upon Catholic tradition as viewed according to the Vincentian rule : he boldly sweeps away the bulwarks of Catholicity, to substitute in their place a blind submission to one man ; who, if report speaks truly, boldly applied to himself but the other

Blessed LORD's own words, *ἐγὼ εἰμι ἡ ῥόδος* κ.τ.λ. Upon system as this, there can be no limit to the developments of , no conservative power by which the Roman Church can be led from departing farther and farther from the faith once delivered to the saints. Canon Oakeley seems especially anxious to show the vast distance by which Anglicanism is separated from the Roman, and to impress us with a clear notion of how cheaply the Church of his baptism; while his line of argument is separation in its strongest colours, and has, moreover, the great advantage, that it would lead any thoughtful mind to long and seriously ere he left the Anglican communion, its failings and shortcomings, for such a semblance of the Church as that to which Canon Oakeley has given in his entire obedience.

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

(Continued from p. 180.)

A important consideration remains—to trace the connection between the teaching of S. Paul with that of our LORD in the Gospels. Many writers have asserted that S. Paul often puts forth *his* opinions, derived from what he *supposed* to be the teaching of our LORD, which they think that he has sometimes mistaken; or, at the best, his teaching on certain points, rests merely on *his* authority. Others will say that the teaching of our LORD is distinguished from that of His Apostles as of “primary importance,” an attempt apparently to insinuate the same opinion in an offensive manner. Theories still more objectionable have been proposed. Thus Jeremy Bentham about forty years ago appeared under the pseudonym of “Gamaliel Smith,” a semi-book, termed “Not Paul, but JESUS,” where with professed respect for our LORD, he disparages and accuses S. Paul of fraud and imposture. But without further allusion to writers of this class who have just as much reverence for the Master as they have for His servant; or indeed, to any other theories of modern times; let us endeavour to ascertain the connection between the teaching of S. Paul and our Blessed LORD. Obviously, the subject is interesting and important. Such questions as these are curious to the readers of Holy Scripture—is S. Paul's teaching a development of that of our LORD, or identical with it? or are we to consider the Apostle's teaching supplementary to that of the LORD? If it be a development, what are the points of connection between the Revelation as originally given in the Holy

Gospels, and the Pauline development? There are, we believe, no *real* differences between the teaching of S. Paul and that of our Blessed SAVIOUR, except as regards certain matters which were hardly in existence in the initial stage of the Gospel Revelation, or during our LORD's life upon earth, as e.g. the three orders of the ministry. The Pauline development has principally at least reference to matters which could only come into prominence when the Church was established during the Apostolic ministry; but the subject must be left to the judgment of the reader (we are only giving our own opinion) after weighing the evidence which will presently be brought forward.

The coincidence of the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostle is sometimes very striking. S. Paul had probably before him portions of the Gospel teaching either written or traditional, as appears both by his subject matter and the very expressions he uses. S. Luke was his fellow-traveller, though it is uncertain at what time his Gospel was written, or whether S. Paul was acquainted with it:¹ we cannot, however, doubt that the endemic tradition of our LORD's teaching was then so definite and explicit that the disciples had no need of a written Gospel—to which S. Paul nowhere alludes. Men did not look for a written account of the great Teacher who had themselves seen Him and heard the words of His mouth. His sayings would be treasured in their memories; His very words could not be forgotten. Thus S. Paul on one occasion bids the disciples call to mind a traditional saying of our LORD, "Remember the words of the LORD JESUS, how He said, It is more blessed to give than to receive." (Acts xx. 35.)

The comparison which we propose to exhibit of the teaching of S. Paul and of our Blessed LORD shall be arranged under the following heads: (1) the Holy Trinity; (2) the Divinity of our LORD and of the HOLY GHOST; (3) Unity of the Church; (4) Apostolical Succession; (5) the Authority of the Church; (6) Predestination; (7) Original sin; (8) the Atonement; (9) Baptismal Regeneration; (10) the Real Presence and the Eucharistic Sacrifice; (11) Fasting and prayer; (12) Celibacy; (13) Faith; (14) Union with CHRIST and His indwelling with us; (15) Spiritual worship; (16) the New Commandment; (17) Peace; (18) Christian rejoicing; (19) keeping God's commandments; (20) Eternal Punishment.

¹ The remarkable coincidence of the language of S. Paul and S. Luke in relating the institution of the Holy Eucharist has often been noticed; both use the words, "the New Testament in My Blood," which are not given by S. Matthew and S. Mark; but this neither proves that S. Luke's Gospel was then written, or that S. Paul had copied from it. Besides, the two accounts are not verbally the same; S. Luke says, *διδόμενον ὑπὲρ ὅμων*, but S. Paul, *τὸ ὑπὲρ ὅμων* [*κλάμενον* omitted by Lachmann and Tischendorf on the authority of A. B. C.] The words alluded to were probably communicated to S. Luke by S. Paul, to whom the account of the institution of the Holy Eucharist had been revealed by our LORD, *ἐγὼ γὰρ παρέλαβον ἀπὸ τοῦ Κυρίου*, κ.τ.λ.

(1) That there are three Persons in the Godhead is clearly implied in our LORD's command to His Apostles to make disciples of all nations, baptizing them in the Name of the FATHER, and of the SON, and of the HOLY GHOST—in the Name, as showing the unity of the undivided Godhead. That the Persons of the Godhead are distinct is not only intimated in this passage, but is clear from other portions of Holy Scripture. Thus at our LORD's Baptism, the FATHER bears witness, the HOLY GHOST descends as a dove, and the SON is baptized. JESUS CHRIST often speaks of His FATHER, prays to and thanks Him, and thus the distinction of the Divine Persons cannot be mistaken. He also promises to send the HOLY GHOST to the Apostles, whom He speaks of as a Person, "when He the Spirit of truth is come, Whom I will send from the FATHER." And observe also, how our LORD intimates His oneness and co-essentiality with the HOLY GHOST. He says (S. John iv. 18,) "I will pray the FATHER, Who will give the disciples another Comforter, to abide with them for ever," and yet in the next verse we read, "I will not leave you comfortless, I will come unto you." Again, our LORD sent the HOLY GHOST to guide the Apostles into all truth, and yet His parting words are, "Lo, I am with you always, even unto the end." The Divine Persons are thus distinct, though united in one Godhead. This unity is clearly implied in our LORD's teaching, "None is good, save one, that is, God," (S. Matth. xix. 17;) Who is also called, "the only true God," (S. John xvii. 3.) The doctrine of the Holy Trinity was not perhaps explicitly revealed (as could hardly have been expected) during our LORD's ministry—the faith of the Incarnation dawned only gradually—"they could not bear it yet,"—upon the minds of His Apostles; still we have the clearest proof that the doctrine of the Holy Trinity underlies our LORD's teaching in the Gospels, which unless its truth be admitted, are in many portions devoid of intelligible meaning. Now let us look at the teaching of S. Paul. He also tells us that there are three Divine Persons, and only one God. The three Divine Persons jointly and separately are invoked for the bestowment of gifts which can come from God only—"the grace of our LORD JESUS CHRIST, the love of God, and the fellowship of the HOLY GHOST,"—and yet as in the Gospel teaching the unity of the Divine nature is clearly stated: "We know . . . that there is none other God but one." (1 Cor. viii. 4.)

But further evidence will be given in proof of the doctrine of the Holy Trinity by comparing together the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostles (2) on the Divinity of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST. The Divinity of our LORD is frequently implied in the Gospel history. Thus, He calls God *His own FATHER*, which can only mean that He was co-essential with Him,—says that He and the FATHER are one, (S. John x. 30)—that He the SON knoweth all things whatsoever the FATHER knoweth, and that all

men must honour the SON even as they honour the FATHER, (S. John v. 23.) On referring to S. Paul we find that he corroborates the meaning which has been given to our LORD's words, or rather teaches the self-same truth. Thus he speaks of CHRIST as GOD: Heb. iii. 14, comp. 2 S. Pet. i. 4; Ephes. iv. 8, comp. Ps. lxxviii. 18: says that all things were created by Him that are in heaven and that are in earth, (Col. i. 16;) that though He thought it not robbery to be equal with GOD, He had taken upon Him the form of a servant, (Phil. ii. 5, 8.) Mark also how the Apostle uses the words CHRIST and GOD, and the HOLY SPIRIT, interchangeably, as it were; not as if he confounded the Persons of the Godhead, but as intimating the unity of the one undivided substance. Thus in the eighth chapter of the Romans, he says, "ye are not in the flesh, but in the spirit, if so be that the Spirit of GOD dwell in you; now if any man have not the Spirit of CHRIST, he is none of His;" here he either intimates the unity of the Divine Essence, or that GOD and CHRIST are synonymous; so also in another passage, after saying that we must all appear before the judgment-seat of CHRIST, he adds, that every one of us must give an account of himself to GOD. Consider again as an evidence of the unity and divinity of the sacred Three how the Apostle attributes to each Person the same Divine acts, as omnipresence and the guidance and sanctification of the faithful. Thus the Almighty FATHER says, "I will dwell in them and walk in them," (2 Cor. vi. 16;) and of our LORD it is affirmed that "JESUS CHRIST is in us except we be reprobates," (2 Cor. xiii. 5;) and yet Christians, says the Apostle, are the "temple of the HOLY GHOST which is in you," (1 Cor. vi. 19.) Compare also Ephes. iii. 7, 2 Cor. xii. 9, Rom. xv. 19, and Rom. vii. 25, Gal. vi. 2, Rom. viii. 2, also 1 Cor. ii. 16, and Rom. viii. 27, where the "Power," the "Law," and the "Mind" of GOD are equally assigned to the three Divine Persons. Further illustrations will be found in the Tract on the Catholic Doctrine of the Trinity, by Jones of Nayland.

A few words shall be added in further illustration of our subject on the office of the SON and of the HOLY GHOST in the work of man's redemption and salvation. Our LORD and His Apostle use similar language respecting the redemption of mankind. The phraseology of both is twofold. Thus our LORD says that He came to seek and to save "the lost," (S. Matth. xviii. 11,) that the Bread of GOD is He which "cometh down from heaven and giveth life unto the world," (S. John vi. 33,) that when "He is lifted up, that is upon the Cross, He will draw all men unto Him," (S. John xii. 32;) and yet in other passages, His words seem to imply that He died only for the faithful; thus He says that "He gave His life a ransom for many,"¹ (S. Matth. xx. 28;) that "He giveth His life for

¹ [There can, we think, be no doubt that *all* are in these passages intended, whether the article is used in the original Greek or not.—*EN.*]

the sheep," (S. John x. 11;) and "His Blood," He says, in giving the cup of blessing, was shed for many for the remission of sins," (S. Matth. xxvi. 28.) Now compare the teaching of S. Paul. He states most explicitly that CHRIST gave Himself a ransom for all, (1 Tim. ii. 6;) that He tasted death for every man, (Heb. ii. 9,) and would have all men to be saved; and yet in other passages, "that CHRIST was once offered to bear the sins of many," (Heb. ix. 28;) "CHRIST," he says, "hath loved us and given Himself for us,—loved the Church and gave Himself for it," (Ephes. v. 25.) The apparent discordance is best reconciled in another passage of the Apostle; he says, "God is the SAVIOUR of all men, specially of those that believe," (1 Tim. iv. 10;) CHRIST indeed died for all, but the inestimable gift of His Redemption is bestowed only on Christian believers, the "sheep" for whom the Good Shepherd died, the Church which CHRIST loves and cleanses and sanctifies with the washing of water by the word.

We have now to speak of the office of the HOLY GHOST in the work of man's redemption. He is called the Spirit of the FATHER, (S. Matth. x. 20,) and it is said proceedeth from the FATHER, (S. John xv. 26,) and yet is sent by CHRIST, and in His Name, (S. John xiv. 26; xvi. 7;) and our LORD says, "He shall receive of Mine and show it unto the disciples;" "all things that the FATHER hath are Mine." S. Paul also calls the HOLY GHOST the Spirit of God, or "of Him that raised up JESUS from the dead," (Rom. viii. 9, 11;) and also calls Him the Spirit of the Son, (Gal. iv. 6.) Our LORD declares that to be born again of water and of the Spirit is necessary for salvation, and promises that His FATHER will give us His most precious gift, (see parallel passage in S. Matthew, "good things,") the HOLY GHOST to them that ask Him, (S. Luke xi. 11.) He calls the HOLY GHOST the Paraclete, that is an Advocate, Intercessor, and Comforter, senses included in the words, "who will teach the disciples all things and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever He has said unto them." He will "reprove the world of sin, of righteousness, and of judgment, will guide the disciples into all truth, will show them things to come, will testify of CHRIST, and glorify Him," (S. John xv., xvi.) Now let us look at the teaching of S. Paul. He also speaks of the HOLY GHOST as the Paraclete or Intercessor, (Rom. viii.), "He maketh intercession for the saints." But the HOLY GHOST, the Paraclete, is also as S. Paul teaches, a Comforter,—hence the Apostle speaks of "joy" in the HOLY GHOST, (Rom. xiv. 17; 1 Thess. i. 6.) S. Paul also calls Him the Spirit of holiness, (Rom. i. 4,) and says that the Thessalonians had been from the beginning chosen unto salvation, through sanctification of the Spirit, (2 Thess. ii. 13,) and speaks of Him as the author of all spiritual gifts in the Church, (1 Cor. xii.) Hence Christians are told to walk in the Spirit, (Gal. v. 16,) for if we are led by the Spirit we are the sons

of God, (Rom. viii. 14,) for the fruit of the Spirit is in all goodness and righteousness and truth, (Ephes. v. 9.) Now though it may truly be said that we find in the Epistles of S. Paul a development *in some degree* of our LORD's teaching, as might have been expected when the Apostle speaks of the work of the HOLY SPIRIT as actually realised in the life and experience of the Christian believer; yet it may also be asserted with unquestionable truth that the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostle is substantially the same, and that S. Paul merely describes in their actual exercise the manifold gifts of the HOLY SPIRIT which our LORD had promised to His disciples.

Another parallelism must be noticed. Our LORD and the Apostle S. Paul only have used the same awful words of those who neglect or disobey the guidance and warnings of the HOLY SPIRIT. Thus S. Paul says, "that it is impossible for those who were once enlightened and have tasted of the heavenly gift, and were made partakers of the HOLY GHOST, if they fall away, to renew them unto repentance—their end is to be burned," (Heb. vi.) And afterwards, (c. x.,) he speaks in most awful language of those who sin wilfully after they have received the knowledge of the truth, and have done despite unto the Spirit of grace—"it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living God." Our blessed SAVIOUR also tells us that all manner of sin and blasphemy shall be forgiven unto men, but the blasphemy against the HOLY GHOST shall not be forgiven unto men . . . whosoever speaketh against the HOLY GHOST it shall not be forgiven him, either in this world, or in the world to come, (S. Matth. xii. 31.) S. Mark says, "hath never forgiveness, but is in danger of eternal damnation." (S. Mark iii. 29.)¹

We shall now contrast together the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostle (3) on the Unity of the Church. Our LORD says that there shall be one fold, or rather flock, (*ποίμνη*,) and one Shepherd, (S. John x. 16;) and the Evangelist S. John, the best interpreter of His words and meaning, says that it was the object of His redemption to gather together in one the children of God which were scattered abroad, (S. John xi. 52;) and in our LORD's last intercessory prayer for His disciples, He says, "that they may be all one, as Thou, FATHER, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they may be all perfect in one," (S. John xvii. ;) and let us look at the declaration on the unity of the Church in the Old Testament, upon which our LORD's teaching was founded. Thus we read in the Song of Solomon, "My beloved is one, she is the only one of her Mother, she is the chosen one of her that bare her." And in the Prophets are descriptions of the kingdom of the Messiah, which clearly imply the unity of the Church. Thus Isaiah says, that "in the

¹ Compare our LORD's words, *βλασφημία τοῦ Πνεύματος—εἰς ἃν λόγον κατὰ τοῦ Πνεύματος τοῦ ἁγίου*, with S. Paul's, *τὸ Πνεῦμα τῆς χάριτος ἐνυβρίσας*.

last days, the mountain of the LORD's house shall be established on the top of the mountains and shall be exalted above the hills, and all nations shall flow unto it. And many people shall go and say, Come ye and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the GOD of Jacob, and He will teach us of His ways, and we will walk in His paths, for out of Zion shall go forth the law and the word of the LORD out of Jerusalem," (ii. 2, 3;) and in the sixtieth chapter, he speaks in prophetic language, that the glory of the LORD is risen upon His Church, that the Gentiles shall come to Thy light and kings to the brightness of Thy rising—"all they gather themselves, they come to Thee,"—their offerings "shall come up with acceptance upon Mine altar, and I will glorify the house of My glory." Thus it is predicted that in the house of GOD's glory the offerings of the Gentiles shall be laid upon His altar, and therein shall be divine and assured guidance; GOD's everlasting light shall be upon her, and all her children shall be taught of the LORD. The Church predicted as the House of GOD implies its unity, for a house divided against itself cannot stand, nor could men find in it divine guidance, or indeed any assured guidance at all. The Psalmist also says that Jerusalem, the type of the Catholic Church, is built "as a city that is at unity in itself." Thus we find that S. Paul's teaching on the unity of the body is in strict accordance with that of our LORD: though as might have been expected, the subject is more frequently brought forward by the Apostle and its indispensable importance continually impressed upon the attention of Christians. (See Rom. xii. 5, xv. 6; 1 Cor. xii. 12, 13, 27, 28; Ephes. i. 22, 23; Col. iii. 15.)

(4.) We shall now show that the doctrine of the Apostolical Succession, taught, as we have seen, by S. Paul, is clearly intimated by our Blessed LORD. Let us refer to S. John xx. 21, 23, and S. Matth. xxviii. 18—20. Our LORD breathes on the Apostles, gives them the power of remitting or retaining sins, and promised to be with THEM always, even unto the end. Now the inquiry is, how are these words to be understood? All will admit that our LORD could not be with the Apostles personally in guiding and governing the Church to the end of the world. They, like other men, were subject to death, and yet our LORD promises to be with them always. How is it even possible that the promise could be realised or fulfilled, except by supposing that the LORD will be with their representatives or successors, those who succeed to their place and authority? Now, that the Bishops were the successors of the Apostles was unanimously believed in the primitive Church; there was, so far as can be ascertained, in the early ages no other belief on the subject. The theory of the Irvingites, or Apostolicals, as we believe they call themselves, that the order of Apostles is a different and higher order than that of Bishops, was not only unknown to the primitive age, but positively contradictory to its teach-

ing, since it was then unanimously believed that *the Bishops* succeeded the Apostles as the governors of the Church, and not according to the Irvingite theory that the Apostolic order, which was perpetually needed for the welfare of the Church, was withdrawn on account of its corrupt state after the death of the Apostles themselves, the inferior order of Bishops being only continued.¹

But our LORD not only intimates, in the passage we are considering, that His Church will continue to the end, but His Presence, and the promised guidance of His HOLY SPIRIT, also assure her that she shall be preserved from error, and all her children, in the prophet's words, shall be taught of God, and shall find in her communion an assured and unfailing guidance. What was said to the Apostles is equally true of the Catholic Episcopate: "As My FATHER hath sent Me, even so send I you. Whosoever heareth you, heareth Me; and he that despiseth you despiseth Him that sent you."

(5.) Again: our LORD also teaches the authority of the Church; nor is it possible to use more explicit language than is actually found in the Gospels. "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall

¹ Dr. Thiersch, who is, we believe, an Irvingite, says that in the primitive Church there were two traditions respecting S. John: (1) that he had not really died, and (2) that he had died and was risen again; and that the latter tradition became prevalent among the later Greeks,* and is expressed in their ritual. This tradition (he says) sprang "from the persuasion of the Church at the death of S. John that the Apostolic office would be preserved to the Church, in the last at least of those who possessed it; that the Church still needed it; that it could not be wanting at the end of the days; that it had yet the works to do of conquering Antichrist, and of completing the yet imperfect preparation of the faithful for the coming again of CHRIST." (History of the Church, vol. i. p. 349, English trans.) Now this learned writer brings forward no proof whatever that the traditions respecting S. John originated from a persuasion of the Church that the Apostolic office was to be continued; and the later Greek tradition to which he refers is irreconcilable with his theory—the origin of the opinion respecting S. John, which arose from mistaking the meaning of our LORD's words, is related in his Gospel (xxi. 22, 23.) Neither is there any proof, as Dr. Thiersch says, "that the fable of the wandering Jew, who falls asleep at the end of each century and then awakes again, till the LORD comes, is evidently (!) the counterpart of the tradition regarding John—the one judgment, and the other grace. And the fact that John lived just about one hundred years may have determined (!) the length of the cycle." Perhaps a more baseless theory, one more completely destitute of any support from the teaching of the primitive Church has not been proposed in modern days; but the theory is not merely a recent invention, but even if put in practice could not answer the end designed. The theory is that Apostles are needed, because Bishops differ in their belief and teaching; and thus that the Church under *their* guidance can never come in the unity of the faith to a perfect man, to the measure of the stature of the fullness of CHRIST. Let us concede this, and restore the superior order of Apostles, and what reason have we to think that the condition of the Church would be improved? If Bishops differ, is there any ground whatever to believe that Apostles would agree together? A fresh element of discord only would be introduced into the Church, and the dissensions of Bishops would at least be rivalled by the more unseemly quarrels of the nineteenth-century Apostolate!

* The Greek tradition is that God, immediately after S. John's death, raised him again, and keeps him, that he may come in the last times to testify for the truth, and along with Elias and Enoch to overcome Antichrist.—Thiersch, p. 348.

be bound in heaven, and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven," (S. Matth. xviii. 18;) a promise not to be limited to the Apostles, since our LORD, as we have seen, promised to be with their representatives or successors; and it is manifest that the same power and authority originally granted to them (the Apostles) would equally be needed in all ages for the government of the Church. Besides, let us mark what led to this promise. In the preceding verses we read that "if thy brother trespass against thee, first privately admonish him; if that be ineffectual, let the admonition be given in the presence of two or three witnesses;" and then is added, "if he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church; and if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican." First, then, a particular case is given, and then the exigencies of the Church in future ages are considered, and an absolute promise is made for her support and assurance in the discharge of her divinely appointed office. By being "unto thee as a heathen man and a publican" is meant, as Lightfoot has shown, to be regarded as excommunicate; and with such an one, as S. Paul says, "we are not to eat" (1 Cor. v. 11;) a passage which the writer just mentioned quotes as illustrative of the meaning of our LORD's words. Instances are recorded, as we know, in the Epistles of S. Paul of his exercising the power which CHRIST thus left to His Church, as in the case of the incestuous Corinthian, (1 Cor. v. 2—5, 7, 11—13,) and of Hymenæus and Alexander, (1 Tim. i. 19, 20. See also Gal. v. 12; 2 Thess. iii. 6, 14.)

(6.) We shall now compare the doctrine of S. Paul on predetermination with that of our blessed LORD. The teaching of the Apostle may be thus expressed in a few words: that God bestows temporal and also spiritual gifts upon some, and withholds them from others, not according to man's deserts, but His own good pleasure; not arbitrarily, according to our meaning of the word, but for reasons which we cannot fathom or understand. Now this doctrine of God's irrespective bestowment of His blessings, if it may be so termed, is clearly intimated in the fourth chapter of S. Luke, where our LORD says that there were many widows in Israel in the days of Elias, but unto none of them was he sent but unto a widow of Sarepta: a proof of God's discriminating favour without any respect to man's deserving, and alleged as a reason why He did mighty works in Capernaum which He would not do in His own country.

Again, our LORD says that if the mighty works done in Chorazin and Bethsaida "had been done in Tyre and Sidon, they would have repented long ago in sackcloth and ashes." (S. Matth. xi. 21.) Here we cannot fail to see that means of grace are, by God's mysterious dispensation, withheld from some to whom, if granted, they would be availing to their repentance and salvation; just as

S. Paul was forbidden to preach the word in Asia; and when he essayed to go into Bithynia, was not suffered by the HOLY SPIRIT, (Acts xvi. 6, 7,) though we may surely suppose that some, at least, thus left in heathen darkness, would have listened to his preaching, and have been converted and saved. What can we say of this mysterious dispensation of Divine grace, which in a certain degree has been before us in all ages, and may be seen at the present day?—some nations illumined by the light of truth, and others left in darkness and the shadow of death; often, as we may think, from accidental causes. Thus modern enterprise, seeking only for wealth, or intent on scientific knowledge, has often been the means of conveying to remote nations the knowledge of the Gospel! Acknowledging that God's ways are unsearchable, it must at the same time be remembered that men shall be judged according to the light and opportunities of knowledge and salvation actually vouchsafed to them, and be punished or rewarded accordingly. Hence, as we read, it shall be more tolerable for Tyre and Sidon in the day of judgment, than for the cities which rejected our LORD's teaching.

S. John says, illustrating the effects of our LORD's teaching upon the disobedient and hardened Jews, "they could not believe, because that Esaias said, He hath blinded their eyes, and hardened their heart, that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them." (S. John xii. 40.) Compare this with S. Paul's words, "Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for, but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded, according as it is written, God hath given them the spirit of slumber, eyes that they should not see, and ears that they should not hear, unto this day." (Rom. xi. 7, 8.) Upon such passages we shall only remark, that God's blinding and hardening was the punishment of wilful disobedience, (see Prov. i. 24—31,) and that the election of which S. Paul speaks were those amongst the Jews and Gentiles who had listened to the Gospel calls,¹ or "the remnant according to the election of grace." Refer to S. Luke's account of the preaching of one of S. Paul's companions, Acts xviii. 27.²

Again: God's election, as taught by S. Paul, may be compared with such passages as the following:—"All that the FATHER giveth unto Me shall come to Me," (S. John vi. 37;) "No man can come unto Me except the FATHER Which hath sent Me draw him," (ver. 44;) "I speak not of you all, I know whom I have chosen;" (S. John xiii. 18;) "None of them is lost but the son of perdition, that

¹ Thus S. Paul says of the Jews, who rejected his teaching, "Seeing ye put it (the Word of God) from you, and judge yourselves unworthy of eternal life." (Acts xiii. 46.) Our LORD also uses similar language to His unbelieving countrymen, "Ye will not come unto Me, that ye might have life." "How often would I have gathered you together, . . . and ye would not?"

² *Τοῖς πεπιστευμένοι διὰ τῆς χάριτος.*

the Scripture might be fulfilled," (S. John xvii. 12.) These passages, though teaching the Divine sovereignty in the bestowal of spiritual gifts, and the absolute need of grace ere men can repent and believe, yet neither exclude nor are inconsistent with the doctrine of man's responsibility and free will. "Without or separated from Me," (*χωρὶς ἐμοῦ*), says our LORD, "ye can do nothing," (S. John xv. 5;) and His Apostle tells us that "we are not sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God." (2 Cor. iii. 5.) How forcibly has S. Augustine summed up the Evangelical teaching: "As the eye cannot see without light, so man can do nothing without grace."¹

(*To be continued.*)

HIDDEN DEPTHS.

Hidden Depths. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas.

BEFORE introducing this work to our readers we will say a few words respecting the class to which it belongs. The *Guardian*, and some other Reviews (though all that we have seen alike admit that it is written with great power and with the highest motives,) condemn the work as one of a class that is outside the pale of toleration. They ticket it as "a Novel written for a purpose," and then assume that nothing is to be said in the behalf of such works.

Now wherein, we desire to ask, is the offence? Does the fault consist in writing "for a purpose?" or is it that the Novel alone of all forms of composition is incapable of being lawfully so employed? Surely no one can maintain that it is wrong in the abstract to write for a purpose? More justly might it be said that it is wrong to write without a purpose. The honour of God and the advancement of truth and goodness ought, we conceive, to be the motive animating every writer. Otherwise persons can only write from mere love of display, or from some worse prompting. And hence we have the sensational Novel, *et id genus omne*; or at best we see writers, like Miss Yonge, suppressing their principles and striving simply to amuse. Even historical writing forms ordinarily no exception to this rule, much less does biography. Persons may persuade themselves that the investigation of truth is the sole motive which actuates them: but we very much question if this is really the case. No one can doubt that authors like Mitford, and Froude, and Carlyle, have written "for a purpose."

¹ This striking passage, which we have seen quoted from S. Augustine's writings, we have not been able to verify.

And so do those who have more pretence to philosophy. Surely, for example, Mr. Grote selected Grecian history because of his admiration for the Athenian Republic; and every one else because he thinks that subject has been wrongly handled, or that he has something to say which it is important for the world to know. Biographers too, one and all, start with undisguised admiration for their heroes. No one has talked more vauntingly about the search after simple truth and in commendation of abstract criticism than Dean Stanley: but it was not on that principle that he constructed his *Life of Arnold*. It is not in that spirit that the *Life of Robertson, of Brighton*, is composed.

Is it then that the Novel has something in it which is specially incompatible with the condition referred to? On the contrary, the Novel seems to us on two distinct grounds to possess peculiar advantages for this purpose. First, it is the popular literature of the day, that which reaches all ranks of readers—discharging much the same functions in England of the nineteenth century, that Greek Comedy did in the best days of Athens: the novelist of our day may lawfully do what Aristophanes did in his: it is the highest exercise of his calling. And, secondly, the Novel possesses much more effectually than the Drama, the power of discussing what may be said on both sides of any subject, being able to employ dialogue and controversy to any extent.

Of course, it is not very likely that any one writing a Novel would treat exhaustively of his subject, or view it in all its bearings. But neither would a pamphleteer, or the writer of an article in a magazine, much less a preacher. All have their views which they desire to advocate: all have their hobbies.

We will illustrate what we have said by one example. The *Guardian*, by that peculiarity of view which leads it always to speak most favourably of those books which are opposed to the Church and orthodoxy, and to pass contemptuously by those of the opposite tendency, recently published a most elaborate encomium upon "*Ecce Homo*." This book, as every one knows, professes to look at Christianity from an "unprejudiced point of view." But what is the result? A line, we would undertake to show, as capricious as any that it would be possible to conceive. Let any one read the chapter on the Temptation, and he will at once see that there is not the least warrant in reason for reception of one part of the narrative as miraculous, and rejecting or explaining away the other, as the author does. It is nothing but the most sheer arbitrary caprice: doubtless it may look like liberalism to give up a portion of what the world holds as truth; but it is done essentially "for a purpose." From the moment that the author of "*Ecce Homo*" made up his own mind on the truth of our Lord's mission, i.e., *before he began to write*, he was just as much a "prejudiced" person in that matter as was the author of

"Hidden Depths" on the subject that he has chosen. There may have been and probably was a time when both these writers had not made up their minds on their respective subjects: but neither would write until he had; and then, according to the theory implied by the former, he was just as much "prejudiced" as the other. The pretence of being unprejudiced is a mere fallacy: one person may be longer in making up his mind than another; one may be more conscious of the process that is going on than another; but really no one speaks, much less writes, without having done so; and no one has a right to say of another that his mind was made up without having done all that seemed to him necessary, and all probably that was necessary, for forming a conscientious judgment.

The work opens with a description of the efforts made by an unhappy girl, ruined and then deserted by a certain Colonel Courtenay, to follow him to India. She is not aware that he has married since he sent her to what his confidential servant mildly terms a "gay house;" and with the fatal belief in his false promises which had been her destruction, she waits in the midst of the sin and degradation she hates till he sends for her to be with him again. But she hears that he is going to India in a vessel sailing within two days, and she hastens to the port determined by some means to go with him: failing to pass herself off as one of his soldiers' wives, she conceals herself on board the ship, and is discovered at the last moment, and dragged out by the sailors from her hiding-place to be sent on shore. She sees Courtenay on the poop, and rushing towards him appeals to him by all the love he had sworn to her and the sacrifices she had made to him of her good name, her home, her very soul's salvation, to take her with him. His wife and sister are standing near, and he is exasperated at the exposé. He treats her as a drunken woman, orders the men to take her on shore, and frees himself from her despairing grasp by whispering in her ear that she is a fool not to know he had done with her for ever—that he is married, and will have her sent to gaol if she dares to molest him any more. When the consciousness of her true fate is thus forced on the wretched girl, she sinks into a silent despair. She is taken on shore, and that same night deliberately drowns herself, leaving a last appeal written to her destroyer that he would rescue her sister Annie, who by his means had become the victim of a friend of his own. When the dead body is found this letter is delivered by the Coroner to Ernestine Courtenay, the Colonel's only sister, who had returned on shore after bidding him and his wife farewell. She had been painfully affected by the scene on board, finding it hard to believe that her brother could be so guilty as he seemed. She had already sought for the poor girl, who was now beyond all reach of help, and when the whole miserable history is revealed to her she determines at

least to do what she can to save the young sister for whose rescue the suicide had prayed with her last breath. Ernestine is engaged to be married to Hugh Lingard, an agreeable, easy-going man of the world, and at first he remonstrates strongly against what he considers her Quixotic scheme of searching out Annie Brook. Finding however that her heart is set upon it, he lets her have her way, true to the one only principle which guides his life—that there ought to be unbridled freedom for every one alike in their faith, practice—and vices. After some ineffectual attempts to find the lost girl, Ernestine learns that she is likely to be at Greyburgh (evidently one of the two universities,) where her brother Reginald is at college.

The history of this brother, though distinct from the main object of the book, opens up no less one of the "Hidden Depths" of evil, which is sapping the moral and mental life of many around us. Reginald Courtenay, destined for Holy Orders, had come to college with a pure and childlike faith, and an earnest purpose of devoting himself to the religion which formed his happiness; but he had a speculative mind, and his reasoning powers were far from strong. He falls into the hands of a tutor who encourages him to "free inquiry," and counsels him to accept nothing as a matter of faith which does not commend itself to his reason: and the result is, that Ernestine finds him dying of consumption, amid all that horror of darkness which total scepticism casts around a death-bed. A true-hearted priest, named Thorold, does his best for him at the last; but no hint is given in the book as to whether this help came too late or not.

By means of this same priest Ernestine discovers Annie Brook in Greyburgh gaol. After having tested how far a comfortable rector largely impressed with the necessity of standing well with the world was likely to help her in seeking for a disgraced outcast, she succeeds in winning the fallen girl to repentance and takes her to a refuge, where the severity of the discipline proves too much for the poor sinner, and she makes her escape and disappears. Happily she does not return to her wretched life; her soul has been touched, and she struggles for a time to gain a living in London, till starvation and misery send her dying to the workhouse. In this state she sends for Ernestine, who at once removes her to the care of an old nurse, where she and Thorold tend her for the short remainder of her life. Late one evening Ernestine receives a message that Annie Brook's last hour is come: she is with Lingard at the time, who tells her that if she does not return soon, he will come to escort her home. He does so; arriving at the moment when Annie is at the point of death, but not too late to be recognised by her as her betrayer: both Lingard and Annie had known each other under false names, and Ernestine had never suspected the truth. This is the overthrow of Ernestine's earthly

happiness; for she and Lingard separate by mutual consent; but she soon finds peace and tranquil joy in the charge of a refuge which she founds for the lost, and conducts on a milder system than that which had nearly proved fatal to Annie. This, and the care of her brother Colonel Courtenay, whom an accident had rendered a helpless imbecile, while it also deprived him of his wife, form Ernestine's occupations for the rest of her life.

Such is the plot of this very able tale, which is worked out with singular delicacy, so as not to offend the most acute sensitiveness. Its "purpose" is to enlist the feelings of young men on the side of purity and consideration for the weaker sex. In our judgment the author could hardly have chosen a nobler "purpose." What may be the relative numbers of women belonging to this unhappy class who are ruined by their own wilfulness, and by systematic seduction, is an inquiry on which we need not enter. No one doubts that if the former slays its ten thousands, the latter at least has its thousand victims. The aggressors of the male sex in act and in intention are quite numerous enough to need such an appeal as this before us.

The only other "purpose" that we can detect in these volumes is the advocacy of a more indulgent system in our penitentiaries. On this subject suffice it to say that the writer plainly does not speak without possessing a large acquaintance with "the dark side" of human nature that has been gained in the service of philanthropy. The advocate of the system which is now generally pursued in penitentiaries connected with the English Church can certainly appeal to the fact of houses well filled with penitents: but we believe still that with a milder *régime* the number who would seek admission might be doubled or trebled, and that there would be a much smaller proportion of failure. It is unquestionable that the discipline employed in Roman Catholic communities is much less rigid; at least so their books represent it. We remember once reading a story which professed to illustrate the method pursued at the convent of the Good Shepherd at Hammersmith, which gave us a high idea of the elasticity of their system and of the felicity of resource which they were in the habit of employing. But of course this was also written "for a purpose."

We have only space for one short extract, which shall be the description of Reginald Courtenay's death.

"As she came and sat down beside his bed, he drew her close to him, and asked with a look of intense eagerness, 'Ernestine, on what ground did you make that assertion last night? What is the evidence on which you found your strong faith in CHRIST and His love?'

"'The evidence of my own soul,' she answered; '*I know Him* in the inmost depths of my spirit, not as a mere object of faith, but as a living Person, whose presence I can recognise to be a vivid reality, as clearly as if I saw Him with my bodily eyes. It is a faith not only in

the historical CHRIST of eighteen centuries back, but in the Being truly existent now, so surely as I live myself, Who this day hears me when I speak to Him, Who this day is conscious of every thought and feeling of my heart.'

"Internal evidence!" said Reginald, 'that is not a ground on which logicians or scientific men would consider that any principle of faith could be established.'

"That may be; but there are some truths known as realities to the soul which neither science nor logic may be able to discover. Reginald, I find it difficult to explain my convictions in words, but I will try.'

* * * * *

"She remained silent, feeling the convulsive grasp of Reginald's hand tightening on hers, and his breathing growing more rapid with emotion as she spoke; but she was unable to divine what thoughts were passing through his mind, and he did not speak. Suddenly a slight noise at the open door attracted her attention, and looking up she saw Thorold standing on the threshold. Reginald perceived him too, and instantly, with a great effort, he raised himself on his pillow, and held out both hands towards him in silence, but with an appealing look which could not be mistaken. Thorold was at his side in a moment, and Ernestine went softly out of the room and closed the door, leaving them together. She felt thoroughly exhausted, and sitting down, she let her hand fall on the table before her, and remained a long time in that position, hardly knowing where she was as her thoughts wandered far into the world beyond the grave.

"At last when a period much beyond what she had imagined had elapsed, and unconscious that her name had been called several times without her hearing it, she felt a gentle touch on her shoulder; she started, and turned round to meet Thorold's grave calm look.

"'You must come at once to your brother,' he said, 'but be prepared.'

"'For what?' she said, with a sudden gasp.

"'For the end which is come. He is sinking fast.'

"She flew into Reginald's room, and flung herself on her knees beside him, but no word or glance told that he knew her. He had reached that awful, mysterious moment, when the boundaries of mortal sense are past though life is not yet extinct. The spirit hovered already on the confines of the unseen, and the eyes wide open, were fixed upward in that look of fascinated awe and amazement, which those who have once seen it in the eyes of the dying can never forget. The sight checked the cry of love and anguish on Ernestine's lips as, appalled, she saw that from the midst of his doubt, and darkness and error, Reginald was passing to the inexorable truths of a changeless eternity. She would fain have called him back, if by any means he might yet have been armed and strengthened for the dread realities opening before him, but she dared not speak.

"Thorold's voice uttering the solemn words of the commendation of souls, alone thrilled through the death chamber, as the dark unmis- takeable shade stole over the wan face, and the breath gasped out at longer and ever longer intervals, ceased at last to stir the white lips *with even the faintest motion.*

"Silently, secretly, the mystery was accomplished. The living sentient soul was gone to know God in His justice and in His love, where no human speculations or error could dim the glory of His everlasting truth; and the wasted form in which it had sinned and suffered, lay cold and motionless beneath the burning tears of that poor human love which is ever so helpless in the face of death. Yes, he was gone! and whether in that last hour the ineffable pity of the Lord he had denied restored him faith and gave forgiveness, or whether he passed away in his awful darkness, could never be known till the day when the secrets of all hearts shall be revealed, and the dread uncertainty must remain as a shadow on Ernestine's life for evermore. What passed between Thorold and Reginald in that supreme hour she never knew. No word on the subject ever escaped Thorold's lips, and she respected his silence too much to seek from him even the expression of an opinion which might have quieted her painful anxiety. Only once, a few days later, as she and Thorold stood one on each side of the coffin, looking down for the last time on the white still face before it was hid away for ever, her intense anxiety with regard to Reginald found expression in the earnest pleading look of her eyes as she raised them on Thorold. He understood and answered, 'It is not for man to judge, only remember this, that while the justice of God is immaculate, His mercy is beyond what the human heart can ever in this world conceive. 'God is Love.'"

IN MEMORIAM.

We weep not—when a master soul hath given
 A voice in music to his spirit-life,
 And told in living utterance meet for heaven
 The thrilling story of his joy and strife.

We weep not—when the wondrous work is finished,
 When peals and dies away the last Amen:
 Only we prize with rapture undiminished
 The echoes of that high celestial strain.

Now we have heard on earth the last vibration
 Of a sweet melody, by God's own Hand
 Played on the harp-strings of His New Creation—
 And full of beauty none save God had planned.

Oh! one hath passed away from earth for ever,
 Whose life was "as a very lovely song
 Of one that hath a pleasant voice"—and never
 That music now shall sweep our souls along.

Yet none can weep—still that sweet measure soundeth
 Within the Paradise of God on high;

In full perfected beauty it resoundeth
Where sin can never mar its harmony.

* * * * *

Who weepeth, when, the sculptor's work completed,
The saint on which his hand so long hath wrought,
With hymns of exultation oft repeated
Into some grand cathedral niche is brought?

Who mourns to think that never hammer ringing
Shall strike again the form we love so much—
That chisel never more its sharpness bringing
Shall smiting wound it with a keen cold touch?

Long time we deemed it faultless, ere the Master
Saw it was good—beheld each perfect line—
Then bore it far from danger and disaster,
And placed it in a church—beside the shrine.

Now a great saint whom God's own Hand hath moulded,
Hath passed away from sorrow and alarms,
Hath prayed his latest prayer, and is folded
Safely within the Everlasting Arms.

The holy hands so often raised in blessing,
The thoughtful brow, the bright and tender smile;
The mouth severe that told of self-repressing,
Are all gone from us for a little while.

We weep not—though our very hearts are riven,
“He hath done all things well” we strive to say;
Blest be His Holy Name, for He hath given:
Blest be His Name, for He hath tak'n away.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Prayer Book, interleaved with Historical Illustrations and Explanatory Notes; arranged parallel to the Text. By the Rev. W. M. CAMPION, B.D., Fellow and Tutor of Queen's College, and Rector of S. Botolph's; and the Rev. W. J. BEAMONT, Fellow of Trinity College, and Incumbent of S. Michael's, Cambridge: with a Preface by the Lord Bishop of ELY. Rivingtons.

THIS book performs really more than its title-page would lead us to expect. There is an entire absence certainly of all dissertations, whether liturgical or doctrinal, so we miss much that might find a place in a Commentary on the Prayer Book: so there is no attempt to explain the relative intentions of the three forms of Absolution: so there is no explanation of the term “saying” the Prayers: so we have no Ritual directions: so there are no Essays on the design of the Holy Eucha-

rist. But this can scarcely be called a loss, for it would not be easy to find writers whose judgments on several of these points could be trusted.

Instead of such a course, however, the authors give us facts, nothing but facts; and we are bound to say that these facts, so far as we have seen, are stated with perfect fairness. Thus on the question of Vestments, the history of the changes made in the First Rubric, as given in the Notes, puts us in possession of the whole state of the case: only, doubtless, many persons would not detect the bearing of what is said. Again, although there is nothing said about the doctrine, or ritual of the Eucharist, the compilers give at once the account of S. Justin Martyr, and so with other subjects.

We said above that we did not regret the absence of directions in this volume; we will now give one illustration of our meaning. In the notes on "the Table of Lessons proper for Holy Days," the compilers depart from their general rule, and venture on an opinion—which happens to be wrong, directing that "a Lesson from the Canonical Books always takes precedence of a Lesson from the Apocryphal."

It is with great pleasure that we draw the attention of our readers to a pamphlet entitled *Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon considered in Relation to Catholic Unity*, a Letter to the Rev. Father Lockhart, by H. N. OXENHAM, (Longmans and Co.) The author's purpose in the earlier part of the pamphlet seems to be to prove that there is nothing in the possibilities of union as demonstrated by Dr. Pusey, which is not in perfect accordance with the "Catholic idea of unity" as interpreted by the Church of Rome: further, he earnestly deprecates and explains the manner in which the author of the *Eirenicon* has been misunderstood by some of his Roman Catholic critics and notably by Canon Oakeley and the editor of the "Dublin Review." But thankful as we are for Mr. Oxenham's honourable and straightforward testimony in those respects, the portion of his pamphlet which enlists our deepest sympathies is that in which he draws out in a very able manner the salient points in that great mournful truth that the divisions of Christendom lie at the root of all the evils and failures which have desolated and crippled the Church of CHRIST for so many centuries. How fatal this disunion has been to the Church of Rome in particular, he shows with a skill and honesty which must, we should think, awaken salutary thoughts in the minds of her chief authorities. Mr. Oxenham speaks hopefully, though cautiously, of the dawning prospects of union—dwelling much on the prophecies which show so plainly that the predicted conversion of the world can never take place till the children of God are "of one mind in one house,"—and he gives his strong convictions on two practical points connected with that future and glorious possibility: first, that while all Christians must desire earnestly that the corporate union of the Churches should involve also the gathering into one of the numerous dissenting sects also, yet it can only be by the union in the first instance of the three great Communions who all claim a true priesthood, that those outlying bodies can be acted upon with any real power; secondly, at the risk of censure from his own communion, Mr. Oxenham records his decided conviction that England can

only be brought into union with Rome *through her national Church*. The whole pamphlet is one of great interest, and apart from a few remarks on special doctrines, there is not a word in it which would run counter to the feelings of true Catholics in our own Church, while there is much to which all who call themselves by the name of Christian must respond most warmly.

The Queen's Vesture (Palmer) is the title of a clever sermon preached by the Rev. HENRY MOORE, Fellow of Worcester College, in the church of S. James, Exeter, on the occasion of the Eucharistic vestments being first adopted there.

The English Church Union, amongst other good services rendered, has published a short pamphlet on *The Present Position of Assistant or Stipendiary Curates*, which proposes the draft of a Bill (wrongly called an Act) for regulating the whole matter. There may at first be a prejudice in the minds of some against the Church seeking parliamentary aid; but as the status of Incumbents depends on Statute Law, we do not see why that of Curates may not equally. On another occasion we hope to say something on another effort now being made to better the condition of Curates—we mean the "Curates' Augmentation Society," of which we approve everything but the name.

This seems also the opportunity for referring to the Rev. E. BARTRUM's remedy proposed in a letter to Mr. Harry Chester, entitled, *Promotion by Merit essential to the Progress of the Church*, (Longmans.) Theoretically the plan sounds well; but Mr. Bartrum's view of "merit" seems to us very narrow, and we should very much dread the principle of competition, and certainly do not wish to see the Ecclesiastical Commissioners overriding the Bishops as the general patrons of all livings. The pamphlet, however, is worth perusal.

The *Authorized Report of the Church Congress* comes out this year in better form, and seems to be more carefully edited than formerly.

We welcome also another very useful statistical publication, viz., *Rivington's Ecclesiastical Year Book*, which reports at considerable length the Convocations of Canterbury and York, as well as the Church Congress, the works of Church Societies, and also gives lists of ordinations, confirmations, deaths, and preferments. There are also reviews of all Church publications. This is the part of the volume which seems most questionable. In its stead we should like to see a summary of events, and an abstract of Acts of Parliament affecting the Church which have been passed during the year.

Dr. MOUNTAIN has published a translation of Erasmus' tract on *Preparation for Death*, (Masters,) to the value of which he is able to testify by himself having derived comfort and instruction in the use of it in the original Latin. Erasmus, though to the last a member of the Roman Church, was one of those who had much more in common with English Churchmen than with modern Ultramontanes; so he speaks of those who address their prayers rather to the Virgin than to her Divine SON, "if not guilty of an impious fiction, *as changing wine into water*." Moreover, his mind was cast in a philosophical mould, so that sentiment is generally subordinated to reason.

THE CONVERSION OF THE NORTHERN NATIONS.

The Conversion of the Northern Nations. The Boyle Lectures for the year 1865, delivered at the Chapel Royal, Whitehall. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D., Rector of Lawford; Chaplain to the Speaker of the House of Commons. London: Longmans, Green, and Co. 1866.

A YEAR ago we had occasion to thank Mr. Merivale for his interesting lectures on the Conversion of the Roman Empire: he has now sustained the reputation of the Boyle Lectureship by the addition of another course on the Conversion of the Northern nations. Such, at least, is the title which he gives to his present course, although the last half of the volume only is devoted to this subject. If we were inclined to be hypercritical, we might find fault with the title, and suggest, as one more appropriate, "The Decline of the Vitality of Christianity in the Roman Empire;" but if the title is calculated in some degree to mislead us, Mr. Merivale has amply atoned for his inaccuracy by presenting the public with a most interesting volume, and in the latter portion of the book he has certainly redeemed the promise of the title.

The preparation of the heathen mind for the reception of Christianity was fully treated in the former volume. The present course of lectures may be divided into three portions. 1. The reciprocal influence of Philosophy and Christianity on each other. 2. The decay of Christianity in the Roman world during the fourth and fifth centuries. 3. The causes which predisposed the Goths and Vandals for the reception of Christianity.

Mr. Merivale commences with a very salutary caution respecting the conclusion which might be drawn from his former lectures. Their subject led him to draw out to its full extent the internal evidence for the truth of Christianity which may be derived from the exact adaptation of the Gospel to the needs of man.

"To show," he says, "that the Gospel harmonises with the feelings of human nature could be no direct proof of its direct and special revelation from God. The argument, it has been said, is two-edged. If it be urged, on the one hand, that God sent His message to men purposely in such a form as would naturally attract and convince the beings whom He meant to save by it, on the other hand it may be contended that the correspondence of the Gospel with man's wants and wishes shows how possibly, how probably, man may have invented it for himself."—P. 2.

Belief in the power of Divine grace, and the examination of the
VOL. XXVIII.—JUNE, 1866.

external evidences of Christianity, is the true preservative against the inference which the infidel might draw from this conclusion. Neither Plato nor Seneca could have invented the doctrines of CHRIST, nor forced them on the belief of men. They might feel after God, and teach the necessity of union with the Divine Nature, but they could neither attain to it themselves, nor impart holiness to others, until the HOLY SPIRIT was poured into their hearts.

"We may trace, then," continues Mr. Merivale, "amongst the holy men of Paganism a certain receptivity of Gospel truth; but we cannot trace, I think, any power to imagine and invent it. If so, the argument for Christianity from its manifest adaptation to the wants of the age to which it was first addressed has its proper force. It is to be used temperately, to be guarded cautiously; but it is not to be surrendered at a captious demand; it is not to be discarded weakly and distrustfully. It has done good service at all periods of the great Christian controversy, and it will still continue to serve us. It gains force by accumulation; it strengthens itself with time."—P. 3.

As a fact, they were not the philosophers or men of polished education who were foremost amongst the martyrs and confessors in the first days of persecution, but men of sterner stuff, and of a less philosophic tone of mind. However much philosophers might be drawn towards the truth, they were generally content to let their convictions hang as yet in the balance, waiting to see whether God would avenge Himself, and assert the truth of that Gospel which they may have believed that He revealed. They waited to see the end of the conflict, and it was not until the Church enjoyed a respite under Hadrian that the philosophers openly espoused the cause of the Gospel. Then the schools of Athens were filled with converted philosophers. Justin, Tatian, Athenagoras, Quadratus, and Theophilus were the first Christian apologists from the philosophic side. The sunshine of prosperity had brought them out like the flowers in a spring day; but a cloud of persecution soon again overspread the horizon, and, although many of the apologists were faithful unto death, the learning of the schools no longer opened to the light of the Gospel. Half a century later the cessation of persecution was marked by an outbreak of intellectual vigour amongst the great assertors of the Faith, which gained a victory for the Gospel, from which heathenism never recovered. Clement of Alexandria, Tertullian, and Origen were now the great captains of the Christian army. It is interesting to trace the mode of warfare which the Christian apologists employed. At first they did not dare openly to expose the absurdities of Paganism, for this would have been of little use until faith in the old superstitions had been shaken. As S. Paul at Athens made the altar to the unknown God the text of his sermon in the Areopagus, so Justin

pointed out the analogies and adumbrations of the truth which might be found in the philosophy of Plato and Socrates.

Justin had imbibed the spirit of the university of Athens, but Clement was reared at Alexandria, which was less wedded than Athens to the traditions of the past. Alexandria had opened her arms to Judaism and Gnosticism; Arabian and Hindoo theology had excited the curiosity of the philosophers. The Alexandrian converts could therefore be more bold in the exposure of the absurdities of Paganism; and Christianity had now assumed the offensive. Notwithstanding, however, that Clement did not shrink from exposing the hollowness of the old belief, he could look with consideration and indulgence on the errors of human nature.

"If Justin sought, then, to make terms with the philosophers, as his own fellow-labourers and colleagues, by showing them that they had been themselves preaching the Word unwittingly, Clement, as one of the multitude, as himself an outsider, consoles and cheers the multitude, by proving that, with all their errors and shortcomings, GOD has never quite forsaken them, but has been ever leading them all onwards as an indulgent FATHER,—has been ever training them, by every thought, and word, and action, and aspiration of their uninformed intelligence, to love Him with the love which casteth out fear, and shame, and self-reproach. They, too, have all been doing the work which was given them to do; they, too, have been faithful over a little; and now He comes with a joyful message to His faithful ones, 'Enter ye into the joy of your LORD.'"—P. 18.

But although the early apologists never desired to represent JESUS, as some moderns represent Him, in the light of a wiser Socrates, a holier Plato, or a more consistent Seneca, there was a danger lest their followers should treat Christianity simply as a new and more fully developed school of philosophy. The mass of believers had no sympathy with the refinements of the schools. The stout-hearted and valiant confessor had not exchanged one sect of philosophy for another, but had abjured the fables of Paganism for the truth of the Gospel. He had no desire to reconcile the two, even although the attempted reconciliation had its use in attracting the attention of many men of refined education, whose minds would not have been reached by any other process. But after the first this was no longer needed, and Tertullian well expresses the defect of the early apologists:—

"Some of our brethren," he says, "who have persisted in the cultivation of letters, and have preserved faithfully in their recollection their old Pagan learning, have composed treatises expressly to convince us that there is nothing new, nothing extraordinary in our religion; that the Gospel is founded, after all, on the common consent of humanity, and has only improved, exalted, and ratified the discoveries of antiquity. But what have these discoveries done for CHRIST? What

hearts have they softened? What passions have they controlled? To such teaching men may listen while it appeals to the intellect only: as soon as it lays claim to the heart, they fly back to their idols again. The labour, then, is lost. A man may spend his life in ransacking the stores of human wisdom, and may fail altogether of the true end of preaching—the bringing souls to CHRIST. The argument, then, is delusive; whether sound or not, it is of no practical value:—Such seems to be the writer's reasoning. Let us try, he would say, some other method more effectual."—P. 25.

To the Christian Tertullian appeals to the Christian Scriptures, and to the heathen to conscience. To conscience he appeals for its testimony against ourselves, and our need of that which the Gospel supplies. The witness of the Scriptures was an argument not properly directed against the heathen, because the heathen would not have listened to it. It was only when Celsus attacked the Scriptures that Origen defended their historic credibility. This was the special work of Origen, a work which prepared the way for the subsequent definitions of dogma; but yet Origen falls back on the generous theories of his predecessors. He presents to us the Incarnate God as the Word revealed to the philosophers; as the desired of all nations, yearned and hoped for by every tender spirit amongst men. The mind of Origen was cast in the philosophic mould. Union with God was the great aim of his teaching, but he carried his system beyond the bounds of revealed truth, and indulged in wild speculations, representing the ultimate union of all things, even of the devils themselves, with God; an error which the Church was not slow to repudiate.

The next age was that in which the dogmas of the Church received their first expression. All that was now promulgated had been held implicitly before, but there was no need to explain in such definite terms until Paganism had crept in disguise into the Church.

"The distinctions, indeed," says Mr. Merivale, "which Arius and his party drew between their views and the extreme theories of the Humanitarian Paulus, are not undeserving of regard. No doubt CHRIST'S Divinity was an article of their creed; and this Divinity they enhanced by allowing His pre-existence to all the creation of GOD. Yet the SON Himself they affirmed to be a creature; His nature they considered inferior to that of the FATHER; His existence they maintained to have had no [an?] actual beginning. He was subject in their view Himself to actual moral probation; He was liable to sin, adopted only on proof of His worthiness. The Logos or Word they held to be an attribute of the One GOD shown forth in the SON as a creature. The principle which underlies all these notions is precisely such as would recommend itself to a Pagan theologian—the essential inferiority of CHRIST to GOD. This principle, once admitted, would cover the Pagan's conception of all the lower deities of the Olympian synod; of

the demigods whom labours and sufferings had raised to heavenly thrones; or heroes and good men made perfect, and exalted to be benefactors of their species in a higher place, and with a wider sphere of power. Arianism, then, was a slightly disguised Paganism: it sprang from the same recesses of the heart; and as such accordingly the shrewd Athanasius himself expressly denounced it."—Pp. 43, 44.

The controversy which was settled at Nicæa was not a civil war between contending parties in the Church, but a struggle between Christianity and the spirit of Paganism. Although Arius rose again from his discomfiture, and was once again the favourite of fortune, the overthrow of Arianism had been accomplished when the Nicene Creed was promulgated. The dying spirit of Paganism gathered up her strength for a fresh struggle, but her ancient prowess was gone; and although for a time Arianism again appeared in the ascendant, the trials of the Church only contributed to the stability of her faith. A generation later, under the guise of Pelagianism, the spirit of Paganism broke loose again. In Arianism the deification of heroes suggested the inferiority of CHRIST to GOD, whilst in Pelagianism the same idea underlay the notion of the sufficiency of man to raise himself to GOD.

The characters of the two great Christian champions who were raised up to do battle on behalf of the Catholic Faith against these two foes, who came in succession to trouble the Church, are well sketched by Mr. Merivale:—

"While, indeed, we acknowledge in Athanasius and Augustine two of the greatest champions of Christian theology in the contest with heathen naturalism, we may remark a difference, not unfruitful of results, in the temper of the men themselves, and in the completeness of their reasonings. The sobriety and self-restraint of Athanasius stand in marked contrast to the impetuosity, the ardour, the exaggerating spirit of Augustine. The aim of Athanasius is simple and limited. It is to establish the fulness of the Godhead in CHRIST; to show that the SON of GOD is Himself GOD in the highest sense, equal with the FATHER, born from all eternity, existing to all eternity, coequal, coeternal. These were the points at which his opponents faltered, on which they equivocated or wavered. They lowered the dignity of the SAVIOUR, and therewith the importance of salvation. The controversialist might be tempted to dwell too exclusively on the distinctness of the Second Person, to forget the obligation to identify Him with the First; or, again, to insist upon the Trinity in disregard of the Unity; to subordinate faith to logic, revelation to understanding. The greatness of Athanasius lay, it would seem, in the perfect self-command which enabled him to retain his grasp of his argument by both its handles; neither to confuse the Persons, nor divide the Substance; not to suffer his opponent to draw or drive him into untenable extremes, to tempt him to a spiritual defeat by the prospect of a triumph in logic. Great as Augustine was, he had not this greatness. The fiery African sometimes launched his javelin beyond recall. He was

evermastered sometimes by his own powers of logic, perhaps of rhetoric. His victory was assured, but he carried it too far; and in overthrowing the Pagan doctrines of human merit and human sufficiency, the errors of Pelagius, he was borne away to the unqualified, uncompromising enunciation of the total corruption and utter helplessness of man; to the denial of all free will and free agency, and implicitly of all moral responsibility, under an absolute predestination to salvation or perdition. He contemplated the utter ruin of all created being in the sin of Adam, not because all have sinned in the weakness of the flesh derived from Adam, but in and for the sin of Adam himself; a doctrine very fearful in its theoretical aspect—in the dismay with which it must affect us, ignorant as we must be of our lot from all time predestined; in the excess of recklessness or of presumption to which it may impel us: but which has been found more fearful still in its practical consequences, in setting the duty of bringing souls into covenant with God above every moral consideration, of converting and baptizing by force or fraud, by persecuting or by lying; of *compelling men* to come in by the sword of the magistrate. It gives a terribly literal emphasis to the expressions of Scripture on the peril of the unbeliever, of the ignorant, of the unconscious, and the infant. It throws a dark shadow over human nature, and aggravates every moral evil which it proposes to ex- terminate. It destroys bodies which are not its own to deal with, for the shadow of a chance of saving souls which are none but God's only. —Pp. 49—51.

We think that Mr. Merivale has confounded the Augustinian doctrine of Predestination with that of Calvin; and therefore the words which we have quoted, are quoted, not as gaining our full assent, but as illustrating the contrast between the characters of these great men. But, notwithstanding Mr. Merivale's somewhat one-sided view of Augustinianism, he is ready to do full justice to the great saint himself, since he acknowledges that he at least was preserved from the logical consequence of putting forward too prominently the doctrine of Predestination, and the utter corruption of human nature. He admits that no Christian teacher has ever laboured more sedulously or more effectually to build up a lofty Christian morality, in spite of a doctrine which would seem logically to undermine and utterly subvert it. There are many apparent contradictions in God's truth, which are only so to us in our present imperfect state of knowledge, but which will be fully reconciled when that knowledge, which we now have only in part, shall be made perfect. Yet Mr. Merivale is loyal to the revered memory of the great African Doctor, and acknowledges that

"he has been himself for fifteen centuries the salt of Christian divinity; every fresh revival of religion amongst us has drawn strength from descending into his medicinal waters; and multitudes, we doubt not, in every Christian country, have been made, through his preaching, complete in CHRIST their SAVIOUR."—P. 55.

Next succeeds a dark and dreary age, an age in which faith declined and love grew cold. The Church had been assailed in turn by persecution and heresy, but the insidious foe of worldliness was a yet more formidable assailant. The Church and the world were now allied; but the Church suffered far more from prosperity than she had ever done from adversity.

"From the age of Cyprian downwards," says Mr. Merivale, "when the first symptoms of moral degeneracy were noticed, the chain of witnesses to this decline is close and unbroken. We read it in the rude satire of Commodian, in the earnest pathos of Augustine, in the politic wisdom of Ambrose. We read it again in the indignant rhetoric of Salvian, in the courtlier survey of the gentle Sidonius. The acts of Severinus, the apostle of Bavaria, attest it: the laments of our British historian, the so-called Gildas, derive from it their greatest poignancy. And there is no witness to it more grave, perhaps, and trustworthy than the great Roman Bishop Leo; none whose declarations on the subject may be deemed more striking and conclusive."—P. 73.

The sketch which Ammianus Marcellinus has given us of Roman manners during the age which preceded the Gothic invasion shows us how little the spirit of Christianity had leavened the hearts of the people. The alliance of the world and the Church then, as at every other time, resulted in a compromise. The attempt to reconcile the service of CHRIST with the love of the world produced consequences most disastrous to the Church; and the united testimony of all those holy men, whom God raised up as witnesses to Himself in an ungodly age, testifies to the utter moral degradation of the people. When the Roman world became nominally Christian, the Church had failed to gain the entire hold of her affections; and therefore the popular mind ran back into old Pagan channels as naturally as the sow that was washed returns to her wallowing in the mire. The Pagan temple and the theatre, the idol sacrifice and the public show, exerted a greater influence on the Roman mind than the Christian mysteries and the simplicity of life which became the followers of the Crucified Redeemer. Not only the people were corrupted, but even in high places the leaven of Paganism had found an entrance. The Bishop Synesius, when called to the episcopate of Ptolemais, honestly declared that he was not a Christian, but a Platonist. He would never believe, he said, that the soul was born with the body; he would never teach that the world was destined to perish, and the Resurrection, as taught by the Church, appeared to him a dubious and questionable doctrine. Yet, in spite of his candid avowal, he was not only accepted by the people as their bishop, but consecrated to his office without protest or remonstrance. Again, during the siege of Rome by Alaric, Pompeianus, prefect of the city, had been persuaded by some Tuscan diviners that, by the mysterious power of spells and sacrifices,

lightning might be drawn from the clouds, and directed against the camp of the barbarians. Evidence is wanting to prove that Innocent, the Bishop, was implicated in the affair, but it was seriously debated in the senate; and it was only when it was proposed as an essential condition that the Pagan sacrifices should be celebrated in the capitol,—which was equivalent to a public restoration of Paganism,—that the majority of the senate refused to join in these impious rites. That such a proposition should have been entertained at all, and that its supporters should have been found amongst the senators of the city, proves how ripe Rome had now become for the judgments with which God was about to visit her.

Meanwhile God was preparing Himself a people to whom the blessings which the Romans had despised should be transferred. The little remnant that had remained faithful thought that the last days were come when the Northern barbarians poured into Italy, and great was their surprise to find that, when Alaric sacked Rome in 410, greater respect was paid to the Christian churches than Christian soldiers had been accustomed to do amidst the confusion of a siege. The conqueror proclaimed that the churches of SS. Peter and Paul were to be regarded as an inviolable sanctuary; and one incident, sufficient to show what might be expected from the conquerors, we cannot resist the temptation to relate, in the words of Gibbon:—

“While the barbarians roamed through the city in quest of prey, the humble dwelling of an aged virgin, who had devoted her life to the service of the altar, was forced open by one of the powerful Goths. He immediately demanded, though in civil language, all the gold and silver in her possession; and was astonished at the readiness with which she conducted him to a splendid hoard of massy plate, of the richest materials, and the most curious workmanship. The barbarian viewed with wonder and delight this valuable acquisition, till he was interrupted by a serious admonition, addressed to him in the following words: ‘These,’ said she, ‘are the consecrated vessels belonging to S. Peter: if you presume to touch them, the sacrilegious deed will remain upon your conscience. For my part, I dare not keep what I am unable to defend.’ The Gothic captain, struck with reverential awe, despatched a messenger to inform the king of the treasure which he had discovered, and received a peremptory order from Alaric that all the consecrated plate and ornaments should be transported, without damage or delay, to the church of the Apostle. From the extremity, perhaps, of the Quirinal hill to the distant quarter of the Vatican, a numerous detachment of Goths, marching in order of battle through the principal streets, protected with glittering arms the long train of their devout companions, who bore aloft, on their heads, the sacred vessels of gold and silver; and the martial shouts of the barbarians were mingled with the sound of religious psalmody.”—Gibbon’s *Decline and Fall*, ch. xxxi.

Thus it soon became evident that Christianity had conquered

the conquerors of Rome, and it is interesting to trace how God had prepared the northern nations for the high destiny which henceforth they were to fulfil in the world. The philosophy of the schools had been, in the case of Greece and Rome, the preparation for the Gospel. The Gospel alone would solve the difficult questions which the philosophers raised ; but as philosophy never influenced the masses, the preparation could scarcely be called a national one. There was something in the genius of the Roman's character, which led him to regard himself rather as a member of an august society than as an individual responsible for his own actions. If on this account it was easier for a Roman to comprehend that grand ideal of the Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, his advantage was diminished by the difficulty which he had in understanding his own individual need of a Redeemer. This was just the advantage which the Goth possessed ; for whilst religion in the view of Roman Paganism was the idea of a compact of God with the nation, the Goths and Vandals regarded it as a compact with the individual. The distinction between patriotism and loyalty which arose from this difference, is well drawn by Mr. Merivale.

" Patriotism was a Pagan virtue, but loyalty is a Christian grace. And as patriotism was the classical, so was loyalty the feudal principle—the principle of devotion to the person of the sovereign. Four centuries of empire could not engender the feeling of loyalty to the Pagan Emperors ; even under Christian teaching the progress of such a feeling was slow and dubious at Rome or Constantinople. But the conquerors from the north brought it with them straight from their deserts, and accepted gratefully the sanction which Christianity seemed willing to extend to it. Christianity interpreted to them their own instinct, hallowed their own principle, established and perfected their own law."—P. 127.

The feudalism of the northern nations formed in them the character to which Christianity was to give life. The essence of Christianity is the love of God, and personal attachment to a personal God. The German in his native wilds was imbued, we are told, with the true spirit of freedom, with thorough independence and self-reliance, submitting to law, not blindly, but as to the word of his own will and conscience, yielding obedience to his leaders, but only because they were chosen by himself. The religion of the Goths and Germans was also instinct with a sense of future existence and retribution. To the Greek and the Roman it had been but a dream which charmed the fancy of a few ; but to the Goth it was the very essence of his faith. It entered into all his calculations. He braved death, as disdaining to spare a life which was soon to be recovered. Thus it was that the doctrine of the Resurrection, which was the central point of the Gospel, came

home to his heart with a force which had no effect on the Greek or Roman. The picture of the missionary Paulinus, cross in hand, proclaiming the Gospel message to the king of Northumbria and his court, is an example of the effect which such preaching was calculated to produce on the northern mind. The sages of the nation were met to listen and consider what answer they should give.

"Man's life, O king," said one of the wisest and holiest amongst them, "seems to me like the flight of a swallow, when it enters your hall at one door and presently flies out at another. Without are cold and darkness, within the fire burns brightly on the hearth, the lights blaze on the table, the air is redolent of wine and viands, the voice of the minstrel carols pleasantly. For a moment it rejoices in our warmth, our light, and our mirth; in another moment it is gone, and flits from darkness again into darkness. Can this stranger give us sure knowledge of our past and our future, of the dark behind us and the dark before us, let us receive him gladly, and entertain him gratefully."

The northern nations were thus prepared to keep the deposit which the Romans would have lost. There was a future for the Christian Church more glorious than S. Jerome dreamed of, when in his cell at Bethlehem he wept over the decay of faith, and thought that the time had arrived, of which our SAVIOUR spake, "When the Son of Man cometh, shall He find faith upon the earth?"

Mr. Merivale's last lecture treats of the pledge for the permanence of Christianity amongst the northern nations. He considers this to be the social position and influence of woman. Pagan philosophy had left her entirely out of account. Small, indeed, was the part of woman in the promotion of moral and religious opinion amongst the Greeks and Romans, and that part was almost wholly evil.

Judaism foreshadowing good things to come, had exalted her to a higher position; but under the Gospel she was destined to fulfil a special and important office. She was not only to be the companion of the Apostle and the preacher, the stay and comfort of the oppressed, the sister, wife, and mother of the saints, on whom the glory of sanctity is visibly reflected, but she was to become the spiritual mother of the children of the Church.

"To her," says Mr. Merivale, "we intrust the training of their hearts and spirits. We believe that God will reveal Himself to our little ones through their mothers. From the mother's love they will learn to love Him; from the mother's truth they will learn to believe on Him; from the mother's prayers they will learn to worship Him.

"But to this position woman has been advanced mainly by the religious instinct of northern Christianity. You have read, I doubt not, of old how among the ancient German races their women were held

in esteem and honour, such as shamed the corrupt and morbid civilization of the Romans. The woman was the associate of the man in all his general concerns. He guarded her purity, he defended her honour; in return she cherished his manly virtues, soothed his cares, attended him to the verge of the battle-field, received him returning from it, unloosed his armour, and staunched his wounds. But neither did he enter into quarrel with his adversary till first he had taken counsel of her, had deferred to her judgment, and inquired of the Divine instinct which he believed to reside in her, to which he ascribed a mysterious sympathy with the future. She was his mistress, his priestess, his prophetess. She was the fountain of his religious life and spirit. She was the angel or messenger of GOD to him. Of the origin of this romantic sentiment, which flowered in mediæval chivalry, and imparted a colour to mediæval religion, there is, I suppose, no account to be given; that it should have lodged itself among tribes so fierce and rude, man-hunters and man-slayers as they were, must be a riddle to us as it was to those who first remarked it. But it was plainly connected with the feelings we have already discovered among them, which led them so promptly to Christianity; to their deep consciousness of the divine and spiritual; their sense of responsibility to GOD, of judgment, and of a future life. It was a strong religious instinct which courted the mysteries of the unseen, and sought earnestly for the means of communion with it. And if it led so directly to the acceptance of the Gospel teaching we shall not err in ascribing it to a special Providence, shaping its means in silence for its far-off purposes."—Pp. 150—152.

Here we have an account of the influence of Clotilda and of Bertha, and of many a wife and mother in every rank of life, whom GOD has used as His instruments in bringing souls to Him, and in training their little ones for His kingdom. It is this northern instinct which places such vast power for good in the hands of Christian Sisterhoods, which the Church cannot afford to neglect.

We wish that Mr. Merivale could have extended his lectures further, and traced the cause of the temporary alliance of the northern nations with Arianism, and the reason of the ultimate predominance of the Athanasian faith. As many of the northern nations were led through Arianism to Christianity, this would have been an interesting field of inquiry; but Mr. Merivale, loath to part with the subject of his former lectures, lingered so long on Roman Christianity, that no time remained for treating the conversion of the northern nations as fully as he has shown himself able to do. Nevertheless we thank him most heartily for the hints and suggestions which he has given, and which we hope at some future day he may expand into a philosophic history of the conversion of the northern nations.

THE SUPPLY AND TRAINING OF CANDIDATES FOR HOLY ORDERS.

CONCLUDING ARTICLE.

IN a former number we proposed to consider the remedies which might be called to our aid in meeting the defective supply of candidates for Holy Orders, and in fulfilment of this purpose we would beg to invite the reader's attention still more closely to the position taken in the first article, viz., that before any effectual remedy can be found, the circumstances of the Church must be such as to permit a conscientious man to carry out his ordination vows. And those circumstances are, to a considerable extent, in our own power; for the Church contains a sufficient number of resolutely holy men to accomplish any righteous object they may take in hand. But they cannot do this unless they steadily cleave to first principles, and do not hesitate to prefer that which is right to that which is expedient. Thus in the large majority of articles and speeches which we have read upon the subject of the supply of clergy we have seen some favourite plan of the writer or speaker put forward as the best remedy for the deficiency, whilst the very first remedy of all is passed over in silence. Not that it is certainly forgotten, for perhaps it is assumed that no one is so ignorant as to forget a first principle. But are not first principles too apt to be forgotten? This is a danger especially incident to theological questions, and hence much of the confusion which we see around us. Begin at the beginning, not in the middle, and when you have settled your foundation you may proceed further.

Now the first principle in the remedy for our Church disorders of all kinds is, to breathe the breath of life into our system, to make it live in all its parts, to show that we mean what we say, and that our ecclesiastical laws, the laws of the Church as a spiritual society, are to be obeyed. If laws exist with reference to ordination let them be obeyed. The late Professor Blunt, in his chapter on pastoral conversation, instructed his "Parish Priest" to teach the people the excellence of the Church's *theory* with respect to ordination, notwithstanding the badness of her practice. Some of his disciples, full of zeal, have tried to carry out his instructions, but we have not yet discovered one who persevered beyond a month. Indeed it is a sad office for any man to be compelled to plead the cause of his Church on the ground of the excellence of her theory, when he knows that theory is continually disregarded. A man of the world would probably suggest a repeal of those laws and ordination vows which are difficult of observance. The answer to this obviously is, that there is no power on earth which can repeal what most occasions our difficulties. There are details which

might safely be the subject of modification, or even abolition, but the great principles involved in our laws of ordination are the principles of God's Word, and the whole Church, and to alter them would be to endanger our catholicity. How, for instance, could we touch the four vows, which we enumerated in the first article? Could we dispense (1) with a clear and lawful administration of doctrine and discipline, and leave it to the individual discretion of the clergy? Or could we (2) allow a priest to suppose that it is not his duty to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrine? or that (3) he is not bound to a life of intense devotion and great separation to God? or that (4) he is free from reverent obedience to his ordinary? The words might be changed if we pleased, but to touch the principles contained in these vows would be to substitute another standard for the priesthood of man's devising for that of God's. Practically there is a great injustice arising out of our present position, viz., that whilst there is no power in operation to compel obedience to these vows, there is a power in operation to compel disobedience, a power not so much judicial as popular. If that power ever is allowed in God's providence to become so great as to obtain from the Church of England submission to its desire to relax the discipline common to the "holy Church throughout the world," our light would be dimmed indeed, perhaps extinguished. "Touch not," is the wisest advice, but restore life, consistency, and vigour to our whole system. Let a candidate for Orders feel that he knows what he has to do, and can do it, and then we need not fear any further deficiency in our supply than will exist in every age, and can be easily grappled with.

There are some other remedies which we would suggest before we proceed to speak of the training for the ministry.

1. Some of our best candidates for ordination are those who have been dedicated in their early childhood to God's work by their parents, and trained up by them especially for that work, and for nothing else, and it would be a great blessing if this class could be largely increased. There are parents whose love is strong enough to dedicate their children to the priesthood under any circumstances, and at all hazards; but we have met with a great number of good Churchmen who avow the principle of leaving their sons to seek what profession they please, and so where we have looked for recruits for the priesthood we have chiefly met with young soldiers and sailors, civil engineers, or colonial farmers. There are also a far greater number who consider what will be the worldly advantage, as well as spiritual, of giving up their children, and who will hesitate if they find that they are about to launch them forth into severe privations with little chance of relief. Probably they are unable to afford an allowance to their sons after they leave the university, and they see that a curate's

life without private means, and without private interest, is full of sore depression. How long do such curates have to wait before they obtain even a small living? According to a statement recently put forward by a committee desirous of augmenting the stipends of curates, there are in one diocese alone not less than sixty unbeneficed clergymen who have served more than fifteen years for the usual inadequate salaries, and probably in the same diocese there would be an equal number who have fallen into rich livings before they have served five years. Long service without meritorious discharge of duty does not of itself constitute a claim for promotion, but when both are combined, as they often are, promotion should be certain, and parents should know that it is certain. As the case stands now it is a lottery, from which the prizes are not even ordinarily drawn by the best.

There is another great hardship arising from this injustice which demands, and does not often receive, the attention of our rulers, and that is, the compulsory celibacy of priests. A celibate priest is, in our judgment, by no means the worst, when his celibacy arises from deliberate self-dedication to God and His Church; but it does seem hard that the rulers and members of the Church should in theory stamp clerical celibacy as too near an approach to Rome, and yet compel it in practice. All priests have not the gift of continency, and it is better to marry than to burn. If they have good livings, or private fortunes, or marry rich wives, they can make for themselves comfortable homes; but some have no livings at all, and others no fortunes, whilst many by no means relish the idea of fortune-hunting, and what is to become of them with £100 a year? Marriage in such a case can scarcely have a result beneficial to the community at large, and the unbeneficed curate has therefore usually no alternative between domestic discomfort and celibacy. Thus with one hand we push aside the corruptions of mediæval times, and with the other force them upon those who are unwilling to receive them. The knowledge of such an abuse must have the effect of hindering thoughtful parents from bringing up their children to the priesthood. It is different where celibacy is enforced. Then, good or bad, parents know what their sons will have to expect if they are ordained, and they educate them for that state, or refuse it altogether; but in such a system as ours there is uncertainty and confusion, which often leads to undesirable results. Let this be done away, so far as may be, by giving the worthy workman worthy hire, and by insuring with due certainty that merit and long service shall have a proper recognition. This will encourage the special training of children from their earliest years for the ministry of the Church; and though such candidates may not always be high-souled and self-denying, they will yet not be amongst those who rush headlong into work for which they are manifestly unfit.

2. There is another way of increasing our candidates for ordination which at first sight may seem to be the very way to decrease them, and that is by the bishops refusing to receive men from S. Bees', S. Aidan's, Lampeter, and Queen's College, Birmingham, so long as those institutions are in their present unsatisfactory condition. The candidates which come from these colleges are not such as to exalt the honour of the priesthood, and if the priesthood is not thoroughly honoured, many are sure to be deterred from entering it. No doubt it is difficult to do without them, but it is a difficulty which would in time be turned into a blessing. At present they are not even doing the work for which they were founded, viz., to supply a lower class of clergy for the poor and populous parishes of the north of England and Wales; for according to the statements issued by the Principals of these institutions, the clergy educated by them have cures in almost all parts of England, and hence the general complaint of a defective clerical standard.¹ And why should it be necessary to provide inferior men for poor and populous places? Is it not an insult to common sense to send those who are least fitted to win souls into places where souls most abound? Bad reapers are deliberately sent into the plenteous harvest, and the good reapers are to be kept for pleasant fields where less labour is required. This is, we are thankful to believe, a fading evil, but it exists, and is encouraged by the theological colleges we have named. They hold out facilities to the incapable to become Priests, as has been proved more than once. And what is the effect of this? The effect is that few really efficient curates like to serve under incumbents who have received their training in these colleges, an evil severely felt in the north of England, where a large number of such men have obtained incumbencies. If, therefore the bishops really desire an increase of candidates for Ordination of the right sort, they should adopt some means to prevent an increase of candidates from independent theological colleges, a result which might easily be obtained by raising the standard of examination for orders.

¹ Dr. Ainger, of S. Bees', says, "Our students are principally in the dioceses of Ripon, Lichfield, Manchester, Carlisle, Durham, York, S. Asaph, Bangor, and sometimes the bishops of other dioceses receive them." This may be seen by reference to the ordination lists.

Dr. Baylee, of S. Aidan's, issues the following tabular statement of his offshoots:

Diocese of Canterbury, Clergy	Diocese of Gloucester
from S. Aidan's . . . 14	Hereford . . . 4
" York . . . 22	" Lichfield . . . 17
" London . . . 15	" Lincoln . . . 14
" Durham . . . 13	" Llandaff . . . 1
" Winchester . . . 14	" Manchester . . . 11
" Bath and Wells . . . 4	" Norwich . . . 11
" Carlisle . . . 4	" Oxford . . . 7
" Chester . . . 48	" Peterborough . . . 10
" Chichester . . . 3	" Ripon . . . 26
" Ely . . . 1	" Salisbury . . . 2
" Exeter . . . 5	&c.

8. There is another remedy which in our judgment might safely be applied to a greater extent than it is, and that is the multiplication, especially in populous places, of clergy-houses. At present it frequently happens that a young priest has to lead a life of isolation and want of sympathy. He is placed probably with a married incumbent, who may or may not be of one heart with him, and who even under the most favourable circumstances, has his family to attend to, and therefore has not much time to spare for his curate. To some minds this is an agreeable position to be placed in, but to others, and those not of the shallowest devotion, it is a great trial, which ends in a continual change from place to place, or a lazy determination to take things just as they are. How different would it be if the newly ordained were allowed to live with other clergy, under proper regulations, of course, and were able to consult them in cases of spiritual difficulty with which they have to deal, and to join them in the frequent devotion which would necessarily exist where many Priests lived together. We are sure from the experience of good clergy-houses where they exist that they would seldom or never want occupants, and the power of attraction which they possess would have a tendency to draw some at least into the holy office who are kept from it by their inability to face ten or twelve years of life in a lodging. Strong-minded men will probably laugh at such reasoning, but let them ask any curate of ten or twelve years' standing whether he would not have hesitated before seeking ordination if he had known what he had to expect. The establishment of clergy-houses where there are many single priests within easy distance of a central point, or still better, in one parish, we venture to think would be no difficult matter, and they would afford men of imperfect faith an easy transition from the delightfulness of college life to the rough work of a poor district. What greater contrast can be exhibited than the contrast between a student's existence at Oxford and Cambridge, and in a curate's lodgings? It is all very well to say that the clergy ought to be men of self-denial, and so they ought; but do not bend the bow too far or it will break.

4. We have just one more remedy to name, which, we believe, would have a tendency to increase the number of our candidates for the priesthood in a twofold manner, and that is, the revival of the minor orders. Amongst the many advantages which would ensue on such a revival are two; first, men would be trained in a lawful and regular way in the lower work of the ministry, and from them some no doubt would be found willing and fit to rise a step or two higher, and we are confident that these candidates would be really worth having: secondly, the clergy of the three orders might be relieved of much of the work which now presses upon them so hardly, as to make a life of devotion, and study, and spiritual direction in many instances next to impossible. We

alluded to this in a former article, so we will not further consider it here than just to produce it as one of those remedies for the scarcity of candidates for ordination which are worth trying. The life of a priest is often repulsive to a spiritual man, who longs for spiritual labours, but is unwilling to have them broken in upon by labours which are not so, and which are forced upon him by the circumstances of the Church.

We are conscious of having treated this part of our subject in a brief and imperfect manner, but our aim has not been so much to say all that can be said, as to set those thinking who really have the well-being of the Church at heart. The same excuse must stand for the cursory way in which we shall treat the last portion of our subject, so large and so full of interest, viz., the training of candidates for Holy Orders. We are thankful to see the improvement which has been accomplished in this training, and still more thankful for the undoubted earnestness in the efforts to improve it still further; but we think we can observe a want of aim in the exertions which are made. We do not mean now to enter into the *minutiae* of the training pursued, as to some extent they will be familiar to the readers of the *Ecclesiastic*, but we would venture to suggest that the theological course which students at our universities pass through is a partial one, and therefore calculated to make only partially fit priests. There is a standard appointed by the Church at which all teaching should aim, and that standard is best discovered by considering the nature of the priest's work. What the Church requires him to be and to do should be the aim of his training. Not that a mere class education is desirable. To separate between secular learning and spiritual learning and devotion, and to say that because spiritual learning and devotion are the great need of the clerical office, therefore everything else shall be rigidly excluded during the season of preparation, is open to serious objection. If man were all spirit, then the training might be all spiritual; but since he has a mind and a body as well, which are acted upon in a manner different from the spirit, and the health of which very materially aids the spirit, the training should be adapted to spirit, mind, and body. The commingling of operations upon each part of man's nature is very conducive to the usefulness of the whole, and hence, defective as the training is at Oxford and Cambridge in one point soon to be noticed, it is yet far preferable to that provided by theological colleges. To read over the prospectuses issued by the latter institutions, an uninitiated person would conclude that the preparation afforded by them is much better than that afforded by the universities; but experience proves otherwise, and the general cry for university clergy proves beyond a question the superiority of the old seats of learning. The key to this apparent inconsistency is to be found in the more complete education of all the parts of our being provided at Oxford and Cambridge. Spiritual, mental,

and physical culture all have their work to do, and according to the earnestness with which that work is done, so each part of the culture rises or falls. We are reaping now the fruits of the lack of attention to the training of the spiritual life, in the fear which men only half spiritual have of entering a calling where so much spirituality is required.

Another great advantage of university training rests in the power of association. Intercourse between man and man, duly regulated by proper restraints, is always good, and the life within college, involving as it does a continual rubbing together of ideas and sympathies, has more to do indirectly with fitting the students for the great battle of life than almost anything else. If theological colleges are to exist distinct from the universities, residence within the walls should be insisted on, not only on account of the supervision which can be exercised by the authorities, but also on account of the advantages which arise from close sympathetic influences. Wherever the training is carried on it should aim at the preparation of the whole man for the particular duties to which he is to be called, striving to cultivate in him those qualities which he will most need in after life.

Now what is the standard which our branch of the Church, in common with the rest of Catholic Christendom, and in her own peculiar position requires her priests to aim at? We say nothing at present of deacons, (1) because according to our practice they nearly always become, rightly or wrongly, priests, and (2) because many qualities are demanded from both alike.

The question is best answered by another—what vows will the priest have to make when he is ordained? These contain either expressly or by implication the pattern of a priest who owes allegiance to the Church of England, and this pattern all who minister at her altars are to copy. There will be degrees of fitness after all, some will be more qualified for their work than others, and probably a high excellence must not be expected from any considerable number; but that does not invalidate the obligation to reach the standard if we can.

The first thing which will be observed by a candid examination of the Ordination vows, will be the high standard of personal holiness which is required. The life of the Priest is to be the embodiment of his teaching. He is to be a type, as well as an instructor. (1 Tim. iv. 12.) And this, not only for his own sake, but for the sake of the flock he is to feed. A bad Priest makes bad people. An indifferent Priest makes indifferent people; whilst one burning with zeal for the living God is sure to inspire others with some degree of his own excellence. He is required to lead a life of devotion and self-discipline, to be diligent in prayers and reading of Holy Scripture, and to give up the study of the world and the flesh. There are certain things which none but a Priest

can do, which also demand a preparedness of spirit and a depth of devotion, to be attained only by daily and hourly strivings. How few are really able to do these things ! It is because they are not trained up to them that even those who might be qualified fall so far short. The Priest has to deal with the burdened soul struggling to be free from sin, and to apply the medicine to heal its sickness which it needs in the various stages of its disease ; he has to seal the sinner's pardon by the most awful of sentences valid even in heaven ; he has to discover the good or the evil in souls which are perhaps unconscious of its depth ; and surely such terrible duties as these, from which an angel might well shrink with fear, should not be committed to the unskilled, as they often are. If the exercise of confession and absolution are contemplated by the Church at all, as they most undoubtedly are, it should be prepared for by training the confessor in his work. Why do Priests often fear to encourage confession ? Some from bigotry, some from conscientiousness, but more from timidity, an unwillingness to trust themselves to a work which involves such consequences, and which they do not feel themselves competent to perform. Much might be done both to raise up clergy personally holy, and expert in guiding souls, if the tutors of the various colleges who are in orders would regard their pupils as a little parish in which to work, and would encourage them to cherish spiritual intercourse with them ; and much more might be done if to the usual subjects taught to theological students were added the study of casuistry, at least to some extent.

The celebration of the Blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Body and Blood is another great act, up to which the expectant Priest ought to be trained. Such vast mysteries as that celebration enfolds, surely demand a preparation of heart and life, and mind, which belongs to nothing else in the world, and the candidate should have this placed before him, not only in the professor's lectures, but in the closer intercourse with his own spiritual guide. He should be made to feel that to touch the sacred mysteries with unhallowed hands is a great sin, and that the continual exercise of personal religion is required to keep him undefiled.

We know the common excuse which is made by clergy engaged in parochial work to free themselves from their obligation to a life of devotion. They say they have not time for it, and they are in nine cases out of ten expressing the results of their own training, which have given an undue prominence to work over the retired life. They are taught to think, to plan, to labour, for the good of others, and we have no fault to find with that, God forbid that we should find fault with it ; but the prominence which is assigned to such teaching, obscures the shorter lessons which they receive upon their concern with their own spiritual being. It would be in vain to expect as many spiritual exercises from a Priest

with a parish of 10,000, as from a Priest with a parish of 1,000 ; but it is worse than vain to assume that the 10,000 people absolve the Priest from the care of himself. And it is surprising how even he can find time for this if he will. There are numberless unnecessary things he could dispense with in his daily routine, and the systematic use of time thus gained would open his "closet" for many a blessed hour. Doubtless in this case social life would have to be shorn of much of its glory, balls, dinner-parties, *et hoc genus omne*, must be ruthlessly immolated, and the happiness of the Priest of a large parish must not be derived from the outer world. This may, perhaps, be binding a heavy burden upon his shoulders ; but who has created the burden ? Not man, but God, and, if it be heavy, before any one has to carry it, he should be taught to do so. A residence for a year or two after degree in a theological college, has been proved to be of inestimable value in helping forward this work, but as there are few who become students there the influence for good does not extend over a very wide field. The Universities ought to do this work. They should provide means for the devotional training of their children, for which they possess machinery that no theological college, however good, could possess. The very chapels are in themselves an army of spiritual might, and the large body of fellows, all well adapted by their peculiar mental training to grapple with intellectual difficulties, and some, no doubt, equally well adapted to grapple with spiritual difficulties, present an array of usefulness not to be found anywhere else. Here mind can meet mind, and soul can meet soul, in the greatest variety, and the abundance of the instruments of training bring a minute application to the special needs of each candidate within the bounds of possibility. To keep all sorts of minds together, good, bad, and indifferent, in a lecture-room, where they must try to digest an abstruse, or, probably, not abstruse point for an hour, set forth by one who is entirely unacquainted with them, is not sure to produce any useful effect. Not that we wish to say a word against professors' lectures, for to many they are most valuable ; but what we should like to see is the same training which turns out an excellent classic or mathematician adopted in the case of theological students, viz., a close previous preparation of the whole inner man by frequent and regular contact with well-qualified college and private tutors. It is the plan which answers with regard to secular instruction, why should it not answer with regard to spiritual ?

The next part of the standard set before candidates for ordination by the Church is competent learning, the very basis of that learning being an intimate knowledge of Holy Scripture. It is a difficult question to solve as to what should be the minimum amount of learning to be possessed by those who present themselves to the Bishop ; indeed it is impossible to solve it, and, therefore, the Church leaves it to the discretion of the Bishop himself, merely

laying down for him the leading principle, that the candidate must be *meet* for his learning, especially in Holy Scripture. Learning embraces a large field; though that which is required by the Bishop ought not to be other than that which bears upon the office or work of Priest or Deacon. To ordain one who is well up in Greek plays, and knows nothing of the Greek Testament, is a manifest injustice; but, on the other hand, the study of Greek should be encouraged, and a critical acquaintance with it to some extent demanded, because of the mines of spiritual wealth which it opens out. We shall be very sorry if the time comes when the accurate study of the dead languages is considered non-essential for the Priest; for bigotry and narrowmindedness will then follow as a matter of course. A warning in this respect ought to be conveyed by the partial teaching of S. Bees', &c. Those who have lived in the dioceses where their sons most do congregate know, by bitter experience, how relentless is the intolerance displayed by those same sons, as a rule. And what else can be expected? for, as a rule, their students are drawn from such sources as make a man of liberal education a *rara avis* amongst them. Then for two years they are *crammed* to meet the Bishop's requirements, and so they are ordained. An exclusively theological education would, in our judgment, be an evil, but *per contra*, the Universities have made a mistake in assuming that secular instruction teaches theology as well. No such heresy is broached in any *document* of the two seats of learning it is true, but it has been assumed in practice. That false principle, however, has been doomed, and will ere long be a thing of the past. More prominence is being assigned to theology as a part of University training, and an honourable part too; and it will be an evil if either Oxford or Cambridge should forget that there is a standard of theology erected by the Church. The first is a knowledge of Holy Scripture, not partial, not onesided, but as full and complete as can be attained in the period allotted to preparation. And here we may remark that our Church recognizes no other interpretation of Scripture than that which is to be found in Catholic teaching. How seldom is such interpretation insisted upon! Not that we would prohibit a freedom of research, or set up an "Index" of forbidden books; but such freedom appears to us to be only allowable as subservient to the great end of Catholic truth. It is not to be expected that a young man can be very *deeply* versed in such a method of understanding God's Word, though he might do a great deal if it were insisted upon as the only acceptable standard, and yet have time for modern expositors. We have no plan to lay down—we only produce the principle, hidden by the dust of years of neglect.

This leads us to another point. It is certain that our preachers are required by the Church to have a competent knowledge of the early Fathers, and the first four general councils, and to teach nothing which is contrary to the doctrine and discipline propounded

in them. How many of our preachers have ever studied the Fathers at all? How many have ever seen more than a general outline of the councils?—and yet in theory these are a portion of the Church's standard: in practice it is not so. Such being the case, can we wonder at the heresies which are continually uttered in the pulpit? Whether it is wise to allow all priests to be preachers we do not ask; but if they be preachers they should proclaim no new thing. It is easy for the active brain of youth to work out some fresh and startling idea, and hence the benefit of giving some authorities to which to appeal, as the Church has done. Soundness in the faith is her greatest care, and it is only by following her standards that soundness in the faith can be attained to.

The next part of the Church's standard is the *work* of the priest. He is to know what that work is, and there are two ways in which this may be provided for; 1st, by lectures upon the priest's duties; and 2nd, by actual labour in a parish before ordination. (The latter plan is part of the course at S. Aidan's; it was also tried at S. Bees', and given up as a failure, except where the students had been Scripture Readers, &c.) Here again we find the Church's requirements superseded by the fancied necessities of the age. For just contrast what is said about the candidate's knowledge of his duties by the Church, with what is often pressed upon him by his teachers. When the Bishop, in his address to the intending priests, says, "We have good hope that you have well weighed these things with yourselves long before this time," he refers to the great dignity of their office, to their duties *as priests*, to their vast obligation to win souls, to their continual self-denial, to their patient labours for CHRIST, and so on; but have the candidates been trained in the knowledge of such things, or in what are called *practical* duties (e.g., plans for managing a school)? ordinarily first in the latter, and then in the former. And what is the effect of reversing this order? It is unconsciously to lower the priest's office in the mind of him who seeks it, and to set him vigorously to work in things which often vex his spirit, and in many cases to prove to him that it is useless to lay down plans of work till you are at work. All real clerical work is full of anxiety and trouble, and what if he has never been clearly made to understand this? Probably he will arrive at a state of confusion in his ideas, which will cause him considerable discomfort. With respect to the plan of training candidates by actual work pursued at S. Aidan's we cannot say much. To judge from its effects we should condemn it, and to judge it upon its own merits there seems to be very little to be said in its praise. If any one wishes to devote himself as a layman to works of love under the guidance of his parish priest it is well, supposing he acts humbly, and most likely he will find benefit from it afterwards; but as a part of clerical training it is apt to make a young man think his experience so great that he will set up his

own plans in opposition to the plans of those whom he is bound to obey. Rather let the candidate be impressed before ordination, by all the eloquence of the public teacher, and all the fervour of the private guide, that the work he will have to do is a hard work, which can only be successfully undertaken by a humble heart, and that its dignity is so great, and its duties so solemn, that he ought to be seeking for constant grace to fit him for it. If details are entered into, let them be such as the Church lays down, the peculiar duties of the priest, and until that is done let there be no enlargement upon duties secondary.

The last part of the Church's standard for priests is a close acquaintance with her own laws; for without such an acquaintance the vows of obedience would be an unreality. What a pitiable position we are in at present in this respect! No large number of priests are endeavouring to obey the Church's laws, and twice as many are trying to prevent them,—a spectacle not edifying to other portions of Catholic Christendom. We venture to think that such an anomaly could not have arisen if all the clergy had been made to feel before ordination that it was their duty to obey the law, and had been taught of what parts it consisted. Custom has been the law not only with them but with their teachers also, and the continual transgression of what they did know discouraged them from searching for what they did not know. We are quite aware that this is a difficult and a dangerous subject for a teacher to handle, but an acquaintance with it is required by the Church, so that it cannot be safely neglected. A stray paper on Church law does now and then find its way into a Bishop's examination, and a stray lecture is now and then heard in the schools on the same point, and that is all. Thus the priest has commonly to make his vows of obedience with his eyes shut.

In concluding our observations we would say that they have not been dictated by any desire to set up any new idea; but they are the result of years of painful experience. They are not addressed to the world which looks upon an article in the *Times* as a solemn decree of a new general council, but to the small world which is determined to discover the truth at all hazards, and to hold it fast. If what we have advanced commends itself to the judgment of this world we shall be thankful, if not, we can only wish all success to any other method of reasoning which may improve the clergy both in quality and quantity. We have not tried to exhaust the subject, far from it. Our desire has been to suggest rather than prove. Whether our readers agree with us or not we are quite sure they will echo our earnest prayer that the mercy of God may find for us some way of escape from what threatens to be a severe trial for the Church, and a serious strain upon that strength which she so greatly needs in accomplishing her divine work of saving souls from death.

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

(Continued from p. 237.)

(7.) THE doctrine of original sin is implied throughout the Gospels, either by the Evangelists, or by our SAVIOUR's express teaching. Thus He says that He "came to seek and to save the lost;" and the parable of the lost sheep which immediately follows this declaration has been generally interpreted by the Fathers of the lost race of mankind, which the Good Shepherd came down from heaven to seek and to save. Again: the world or the human race is represented by our LORD as being in a state of condemnation. "As Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish; for God sent not His SON into the world to condemn the world." Here we cannot mistake our LORD's teaching, that mankind at His Advent were perishing, just as the Israelites when bitten by fiery serpents; and that the world was then in a state of condemnation, from which only it could be rescued by His redemption. Our LORD also intimates that mankind were then in a state of spiritual death. Thus He says, "I am come that they might have life, and might have it more abundantly." (S. John x. 10.) And mankind are often described as being in a state of darkness. Isaiah predicts that "the people who sat in darkness have seen a great light; they that dwell in the land of the shadow of death, upon them hath the light shined," (ix. 2;) a prophecy applied by the Evangelist S. Matthew to our LORD's residence in Capernaum. (S. Matth. iv. 15, 16.) S. John says, "In Him was Life, and the Life was the Light of men, and the Light shineth in darkness," (i. 4, 5;) our LORD also tells the Jews, "I am come a Light unto the world, that whosoever believeth on Me should not walk in darkness." (S. John xii. 46; see also iii. 19.)

Now the passages which have been quoted may, we admit, be considered as descriptive of the actual state of mankind at our LORD's Advent, yet they can hardly be limited to the existing state of Jewish or heathen corruption; they are, we think, too strongly expressed, and too general in their application. Mankind, e.g., are represented as dying of a fatal disease, for which a crucified SAVIOUR, the antitype of the brazen serpent, is the only remedy. Now whence originated a disease so universally prevailing, so deadly in its effects? Our LORD does not inform us, but He certainly describes the disease itself most emphatically, which *could only* have one origin, i.e., the transgression of our first parents. We shall find that the doctrine of original sin is fully revealed and ex-

plicitly taught by S. Paul: let especial attention be given to the illustrations of the Apostle, and we shall find them almost identical with those of our LORD, and affording a clear explanation of *His* meaning. The Apostle S. Paul affirms of mankind, Jews and Gentiles, that these are all under sin, (Rom. iii.,) and the reason is afterwards explicitly stated, "by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation;" and in the next verse, "by one man's disobedience many were made sinners." (Rom. v. 18, 19.) Such is the state of the world through one man's disobedience; all are by nature (φύσει) "children of wrath," "without hope and without God in the world," (Ephes. ii. 3, 12;) and mankind, thus exposed, through Adam's transgression, to eternal condemnation, are represented by the Apostle as "lost," and in a state of "darkness" and of spiritual "death," metaphors which were probably derived from the teaching and illustrations of our Blessed LORD. Mankind are by nature the lost; "if our Gospel is hid, it is hid to the lost—ἀπολλυμένοις,"¹ (2 Cor. iv. 3;) also in a state of darkness, "Ye who were sometimes darkness are now light in the LORD," (Eph. v. 8; see also 1 Thess. v. 4;) "God, Who hath caused the light to shine out of darkness, hath shined in our hearts," (2 Cor. iv. 6;) and of spiritual death, "You hath He quickened who were dead in trespasses and sins," (Ephes. ii. 1;) "Awake, thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and CHRIST shall give thee light," (Ephes. v. 14;) "And you, being dead in your sins and the uncircumcision of your flesh, hath He quickened together with Him." (Col. ii. 13.)

(8.) Now on comparing together the teaching of our LORD and of S. Paul on the doctrine of the Atonement, it will be necessary to give a few quotations from the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, in which this doctrine is most explicitly stated. That Isaiah predicted the sufferings of our SAVIOUR is clearly implied in Scripture,² and expressly stated by S. Matthew (viii. 17,) and S. Mark: the latter saying that the Scripture was fulfilled which said He was numbered with the transgressors (xv. 28.) Now let us consider the teaching of Isaiah in this chapter: thus he says, (v. 4,) "He bears our sins and is put to grief for us (τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν φέρει καὶ περὶ ἡμῶν ὀδυῖται:;) v. 5, He was wounded for our transgressions, (διὰ τὰς ἀμαρτίας ἡμῶν,) and bruised for our iniquities, (διὰ τὰς ἐνομίας ἡμῶν:) the chastisement of our peace was upon Him, (παιδεία εἰρήνης ἡμῶν ἐπ' αὐτόν,) and by His stripes we were healed, (μῶλωπι αὐτοῦ ἡμεῖς ἰάθημεν:;) v. 6, All we like sheep have gone astray; man has gone astray in his way, and the LORD hath given Him up for our sins, (παρέδωκεν αὐτόν ταῖς ἀμαρτίαις ἡμῶν,) He was led as a sheep to the slaughter, and as a lamb before her shearers is dumb, so He opens not His mouth; v. 8, for the ini-

¹ Our LORD says He came to save τὸ ἀπολωλός.

² Acts viii. 32—35; 1 S. Peter ii. 22—24.

quities of my people was He led to death, (*ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνομιῶν τοῦ λαοῦ μου ἤχθη εἰς θάνατον*;) v. 10, if ye can give (an offering) for sin your soul shall see a long-lived seed, (*ἐὰν δῶτε περὶ ἁμαρτίας ἡ ψυχὴ ὑμῶν ὄψεται σπέρμα μακρόβιον*;) v. 12, His soul was delivered to death and He was numbered with the transgressors, and He bare the sins of many, and was delivered up because of their iniquities. (*παρεδόθη εἰς θάνατον ἡ ψυχὴ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἀνόμοις ἐλογίσθη, καὶ αὐτὸς ἁμαρτίας πολλῶν ἀνένεγκε καὶ διὰ τὰς ἀνομίας αὐτῶν παρεδόθη.*)”

On referring to the teaching of our Lord and of the Apostle, we shall find that it is founded on the chapter before us, and may be illustrated by referring to other passages of the Septuagint. Thus our Lord says, (S. Matth. xx. 28; S. Mark x. 45,) that “He gave His life a ransom for many,” (*λῶτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν*), and that when lifted up on the cross He will draw all men (*πάντας*) unto Him. (S. John xii. 32.) He likewise tells us that He gives His flesh for the life of the world, (S. John vi. 51,) and “gives His life for the sheep.” (S. John x. 11.) We find also from S. Paul’s Epistles that CHRIST was given a ransom for all, (*ἀντίλυτρον ὑπὲρ πάντων*, 1 Tim. ii. 6,) that He was given for us, (*ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν*, Titus ii. 14:) “was offered to bear the sins of many,” (*πολλῶν ἀνετέγκειν ἁμαρτίας*, Heb. ix. 28,) and that He might taste death for every man (*ὥπως ὑπὲρ παντὸς γεύσεται θανάτου*. Heb. ii. 9.) Now mark the correspondence between the teaching of Isaiah and of the Old Testament and that of our Lord and His Apostle. Our Lord says that He gave His life a ransom for many, and that “His flesh was given for the life of the world.” S. Paul also uses the same word, ransom, and says in the very words of Isaiah, that “CHRIST bare the sins of many.” The word “ransom” was taken from the Septuagint. (Numb. xxxv. 31.) “Ye shall not accept ransoms for life (*λύτρα περὶ ψυχῆς*) from a murderer.” “Thy people whom Thou hast redeemed or ransomed,” (*ὃν ἐλυτρώσω*. Exod. xv. 13.) In the sixteenth of Leviticus, Aaron is commanded to make propitiation for himself and his house, and shall slay the calf for his sins, (*ἐξιλάσεται περὶ ἑαυτοῦ καὶ τοῦ οἴκου· καὶ σφάξει τὸν μόσχον περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας αὐτοῦ*), and in the twenty-first verse the scape goat we read was to be drawn into the wilderness, “bearing all the sins and iniquities of the children of Israel.” Compare with this typical propitiation the antitype of whom Daniel says, “Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon the holy city to put an end to iniquity and to seal up (*σφραγίσαι*) sins, and to blot out iniquities, and to make an atonement (*ἐξιλάσασθαι*) for transgressions, and to bring in everlasting righteousness. (ix. 24.)

Such is the divine teaching of the Old Testament and of our Lord and His Apostle; the typical language of the Old Testament is reproduced in its relation to the antitype, without an attempt to explain or render more intelligible the deep mysteries which it involves. We find also in the early Fathers merely a repetition of

the words or illustrations of Holy Scripture. We do not find in their works any theories of "satisfaction," which belong to later times, or schemes to elucidate a truth perhaps in our present state beyond comprehension—but the doctrine is set forth practically according to Holy Scripture, as affording a blessed assurance of comfort, amidst the trials and temptations of life and the forebodings of our own hearts. We know only—but the knowledge is all-sufficient for our needs—that man had sinned, and the Son of God suffered in his stead; that all we like sheep have gone astray, and the LORD has laid on Him the iniquity of us all.

(9.) The teaching of our Blessed LORD on Holy Baptism shall now be compared with that of S. Paul. His conversation with Nicodemus in which He teaches the need of a new Birth by water and the Spirit, shall first be considered. It is unnecessary to prove that the Sacrament of Holy Baptism, or the outward sign and the inward grace of regeneration—is here referred to, as the ancient Fathers unanimously taught; since our LORD's words will not bear any other meaning, nor has any other probable or even tenable interpretation been proposed by modern commentators.

Let us also consider the conversation of our LORD with the woman of Samaria. He says to her (S. John iv.), "if thou knewest the gift of God, and who it is that saith to thee, Give Me to drink; thou wouldst have asked of Him, and He would have given thee living water . . . a well of water springing up into everlasting life." Under this type of water the gift of the Holy Spirit had often been predicted in the Old Testament, as our LORD afterwards declares, "He that believeth on Me, as the Scripture saith, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water. But this spake He of the Spirit, which they that believe on Him should receive, for the HOLY GHOST was not yet given; because that JESUS was not yet glorified." (S. John vii. 38, 39.) Now let us turn to the second chapter of the Acts of the Apostles, in which the descent of the HOLY GHOST is related. S. Peter says to the Jews that JESUS being by the right hand of God exalted, and having received of the FATHER the promise of the HOLY GHOST, hath shed forth this which ye now see and hear. And when his hearers were pricked to the heart, and said to Peter and to the rest of the Apostles: Men and brethren, what shall we do? Peter said unto them, "Repent, and be baptized, every one of you, in the name of JESUS CHRIST, for the remission of sin, and ye shall receive the gift of the HOLY GHOST, for the promise is to you and to your children." Here we see the fulfilment of our LORD's words to the woman of Samaria, when He promised the living water; it was the gift of the HOLY SPIRIT which was bestowed first on the Apostles, and afterwards on all who believed on CHRIST through their word,—the gift of regeneration in the laver of baptism.

When our LORD washed the feet of His disciples (S. John xiii.)

He alluded, as the Fathers teach, to the Holy Sacrament of Baptism; "He that is washed, needeth not save to wash his feet, but is clean every whit." "Clean all," says S. Augustine, "except his feet. The whole of a man is washed in baptism, not excepting his feet; but living in the world afterwards we tread upon the earth. Those human affections, therefore, without which we cannot live in this world, are, as it were, our feet which connect us with human things, so that *if we say we have no sin we deceive ourselves*. But if we confess our sins, He, who washed the disciples' feet, forgives us our sins, even down to our feet, wherewith we hold our converse with earth."¹

(10.) We shall now show that our LORD teaches the same doctrine of the Real Presence and of the Eucharistic sacrifice which has been already illustrated from the Epistles of S. Paul. His words in instituting the Holy Eucharist first claim consideration, and have been quoted in all ages, not merely as implying, but as distinctly enunciating and stating the doctrine of the Real Presence. He says, when giving the Bread and Wine to His Apostles, "This is My Body—this is My Blood;" words which require no explanation, and which ought by their obvious meaning to exclude all doubt and controversy. Modern writers who have not faith to receive them literally have given a figurative meaning to our LORD's words, and have quoted as similar to them other sayings, as that "He was the door" and the "vine;" but it has been frequently proved that there is no parallelism whatever in the instances alleged, and thus that His words must be understood in their obvious and literal sense. It is an observable fact, that the ancient commentators not only interpreted the words of Institution literally, but that a figurative interpretation does not seem to have occurred, nay, was utterly unknown to them. They not only take these words literally, but do not seem to think that any other interpretation could possibly be given. Thus S. Cyril says, "Since then He Himself has declared and said of the Bread, *This is My Body*, who shall dare to doubt any longer? and since He has affirmed and said, *This is My Blood*, who shall ever hesitate, saying, that it is not His Blood."²

Let us now refer to the sixth chapter of S. John, where our LORD according to the unanimous opinion of the ancient and most distinguished modern commentators, refers prospectively to the institution of the Holy Eucharist. It seems strange indeed that any other interpretation could have been given, if we consider our LORD's very emphatic and oft-repeated words of eating His flesh and drinking His blood, for though, in a certain sense, we may be said to eat His flesh and drink His blood when we believe on Him, and by faith appropriate "to our soul's health" His most precious blood shedding, yet this meaning is not only a remote and figu-

¹ Aurea Catena *in loc.*

² Lect. xxii. 51, (Oxf. trans.)

rative one, but is for other reasons, inadmissible as regards the chapter before us. If our LORD had been merely impressing upon the Jews the duty of believing on Him, why should He use any other language than that which He had so frequently employed, as in the beginning of this chapter, and introduce strange and unheard of (may we not say uncalled for,) phrases which were not only likely to offend His hearers, but which He must have foreseen would actually lead them to forsake Him, or why should He repeat again and again with the most solemn asseverations the same words by which they had been scandalized? It is strange indeed that any commentator should think that the full meaning of our LORD's words was exhausted, so to speak, by the meaning just referred to of our having faith in Him, and had no further allusion to the Blessed Eucharist in which only His words could receive their full and entire accomplishment, and especially when the words used by our LORD, both on this occasion and in the institution of the Holy Eucharist, were almost verbally the same—"Take, eat," He says, in giving the Blessed Sacrament to His Apostles, "this is My Body, which is given for you; and He took the cup and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of it, for this is My Blood, which is shed for many for the remission of sins." Compare this passage with the following extracts from the sixth chapter of S. John, and the parallelism is clear and unmistakeable. "The bread which I will give you," our LORD says in the sixth chapter, "is My flesh which I will give for the life of the world—whoso eateth My flesh, and drinketh My blood, hath eternal life."

In these passages, instead of "His body being given for you," as in the words of Institution—His flesh (a synonymous expression,) is said to be given "for the life of the world,"—a phrase of like meaning as we before explained, speaking of our LORD's redemption; and the reason why the gift of eternal life is here promised to those who eat His flesh and drink His blood, and who "dwell in CHRIST," and live by Him, will be found in the words of Institution, viz., that His body was given and His blood shed *for the remission of sins*. For what can debar His people either now or hereafter from eternal life but sin? and how can sin be pardoned, and the new nature be imparted, whereby we dwell in CHRIST and CHRIST in us, but by eating His flesh and drinking His blood in the Holy Mysteries of the Altar? Thus these passages contrasted together, explain and can be harmonised with each other, showing their common reference to the Blessed Eucharist.

We shall now, in illustration of our LORD's teaching in this chapter, quote a few extracts from the translation just published of Hengstenberg's Commentary on this Gospel. His remarks are especially worthy of notice, showing that the most learned modern scholars (even without reference to the teaching of the Fathers, or

of tradition,) have both proved, on ordinary principles of exegesis, the Catholic interpretation of Scripture; and also, that no other interpretation is either tenable or possible. He says,

“When JESUS speaks of the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood, he understands primarily by this a relation which may at once be formed, the giving up of one’s own natural life and being, and unconditional consecration to the Son of man, so that His holy flesh and blood take the place of that which is natural and unholy, and His theanthropic personality penetrates and ennobles that of the ordinary man, so that he can say, ‘I live, yet not I, but CHRIST liveth in me.’ We can obtain a clear conception of this, in the case of the disciple whom JESUS loved, and who rested in His bosom. He had already truly eaten before the atoning death of JESUS CHRIST with the mouth of the spirit and had drunk His blood, and had been a different person as one alive from the dead—he had obtained different inclinations and impulses, different features, a different look, and a different step. But there were further developements before him, in which the eating of the flesh and drinking of the blood received a deeper meaning; and CHRIST had these developements already in view, when He with so much emphasis made all salvation dependent on the eating of His flesh and the drinking of His blood. After CHRIST had offered up His flesh upon the cross, and had thus earned new power of life for our flesh which was pervaded with death; and after His sacred blood had there taken away sin, He became in a still higher degree the food of the soul. . . . His ‘body for us wounded,’ and His sacred blood were made by an adorable mystery, and an ever-repeated miracle, the central-point of the Church.”¹

The teaching of our LORD on the Eucharistic Sacrifice shall now be considered. The Church has always interpreted His words on the Institution of the Blessed Eucharist, “Do this in remembrance of Me,” as meaning “Offer this (sacrifice) for a memorial of Me.” This interpretation of our LORD’s words was contemptuously set aside by the late Dr. Arnold, as a “Newmanite” theory. We shall quote his words, and then vindicate the Catholic interpretation. Dr. Arnold says, (in a letter to Mr. Justice Coleridge, June 26, 1841,)—

“The Newmanite interpretation of our LORD’s words, ‘Do this in remembrance of Me,’ you confess to have startled you. Surely it may well startle any man; for no Unitarian comment on the first chapter of S. John could possibly be more monstrous. Now in such matters I speak and feel confidently from the habits of my life. My business, as schoolmaster, is a constant exercise in the interpreting language in cases where no prejudice can warp the mind one way or another, and this habit of interpretation has been constantly applied to the Scriptures for more than twenty years; for I began the careful study

¹ Commentary on S. John, vol. i. p. 352, 3. (Edinb. 1865.)

of the Epistles long before I left Oxford, and have never intermitted it. I feel, therefore, even more strongly towards a misinterpretation of Scripture than I should towards a misinterpretation of Thucydides."¹

The sum of Dr. Arnold's remarks is, that he is a schoolmaster, and has been engaged for many years in the interpretation of Holy Scripture, and, therefore, that *his* interpretation of a Greek word or sentence ought not to be questioned. Notwithstanding this *argumentum ad verecundiam*, we assert that Dr. Arnold has shown most inexcusable ignorance in calling the interpretation a "Newmanite" one—whether the expression means that it was invented by Dr. Newman, or any of his friends, or even first proposed during the Tractarian (so called,) or Church movement. We shall also prove that the interpretation censured, is the only one which can possibly be given of this passage.

Now in interpreting the New Testament, we must principally refer to the Septuagint, or the Greek translation of the Old Testament, which will illustrate its language and meaning far better than any commentaries, either ancient or modern. Grinfield, in the Hellenistic edition of the Greek Testament, has quoted 80,000 passages, illustrating the words, phrases, and meaning of the New; and has shown that our Lord and His Apostles have generally quoted the Septuagint of the Old Testament, even when widely differing from the Hebrew original, stamping at least such passages as being of inspired or Divine authority. He has also asserted that the Septuagint version (which in some portions, as in the Prophet Isaiah, differs materially from the Hebrew original,) is inspired, and that S. Jerome was the first writer who maintained a contrary opinion. Be this as it may, this version is of the highest importance and authority in illustrating the meaning of words and phrases in the New Testament. Now what is the meaning of ποιέω in the Septuagint? Its undoubted sense in many passages is to "offer," or "sacrifice." A few examples shall be given. "And thou shalt offer (ποιήσεις) every day a bullock, (Exod. xxix. 36.) Now this is that which thou shalt offer (ποιήσεις) upon the altar, (ibid. v. 38.) The one lamb thou shalt offer (ποιήσεις) in the morning, and the other lamb thou shalt offer (ποιήσεις) at even," (ibid. v. 39; see also v. 41.) "And he shall offer (ποιήσει) the bullock as he offered (έποίησεν) the bullock for a sin-offering, thus shall it be offered, (ποιηθήσεται.)" (Levit. iv. 20.) Other passages have been quoted by Johnson, Hickey, and Brett; but those already given will suffice. Let us now consider the meaning of this word ποιέω in the early Fathers. A few extracts from S. Justin shall be given; a writer of greater authority cannot be quoted, as he follows immediately the Apostolic age, and wrote in the same language as the inspired authors of the

¹ Arnold's "Life and Correspondence," vol. ii. p. 224, 5. (Lond. 1858.)

New Testament. Three instances occur in his writings, where, in allusion to the words of Institution, *ποιέω* means to sacrifice. He says,

"In like manner the oblation of the flour, which was commanded to be offered for those who were cleansed from leprosy, was a type of the bread of the Eucharist which JESUS CHRIST our LORD commanded us to offer (*ποιεῖν*) in remembrance of the Passion which He underwent.¹ It is plain that this prophecy (Isaiah xxxiii. 13—20,) speaks of the bread which our CHRIST gave us to offer (*ποιεῖν*) in commemoration of His having taken flesh in behalf of those who believe in Him, for whose sake He also suffered."² "That prayers, indeed, and thanksgivings offered up by the worthy, are the only sacrifices which are perfect and acceptable to GOD is what I myself also affirm, for these alone the Christians also have been taught to offer (*ποιεῖν*), and that in the remembrance made by their food both solid and liquid, in which there is a commemoration also of the Passion endured for their sakes by the SON of GOD."³

Such is the meaning of *ποιέω*, as given by a writer who follows immediately the age of the Apostles, and the same interpretation is implied by many subsequent writers, who appeal to our LORD's words as proving, or illustrating the doctrine of the Eucharistic Sacrifice. Thus we cannot doubt that the Apostolical Constitutions, though not written by the Apostles, clearly show the belief of the Church before the Council of Nicæa. It will be hardly necessary to prove that the "Constitutions" teach the offering of sacrifice in the Holy Eucharist, as this doctrine is frequently stated or implied in the 7th or 8th books;⁴ but the Eucharistic Sacrifice we shall also find is immediately connected with and founded on our Blessed LORD's words, "Do this," &c. "For this reason, after the LORD's resurrection, offer your sacrifice, concerning which He commanded you by us (the Apostles,) saying, 'Do this in remembrance, &c.'"⁵

Dr. Arnold, as we have said, seemed at least to suppose that on account of his profession, which gave him peculiar advantages in ascertaining the meaning of Greek words or sentences, his *dictum* should be implicitly received. Now admitting the advantages which he claimed, how strange that he should have forgotten a well-known Greek writer, who sanctions the interpretation which he has so unsparingly condemned. We refer to the history of Herodotus: in his first book a passage will be found, in which

¹ Dial. c. Tryph. § 41.

² Dial. c. Tryph. § 70.

³ Dial. c. Tryph. § 117.

⁴ One passage shall be quoted: Προσφέρουμέν σοι τῷ Βασιλεῖ καὶ Θεῷ κατὰ τὴν αὐτοῦ Χριστοῦ διάταξιν τὸν ἕρπον καὶ ποτήριον τοῦτο εὐχαριστοῦντές σοι διὰ αὐτοῦ ἐφ' οἷς κατηξίωσας ἡμᾶς ἐστάναι ἐνώπιόν σοι καὶ ἱερατεῦν σοι.—Lib. viii.

⁵ Διὰ τοῦτο οὖν καὶ ὑμεῖς, ἀναστάντος τοῦ Κυρίου προσετέγκατε τὴν θυσίαν ὁμῶν, περὶ ἧς ὑμῖν διεδόξατο διὰ ἡμῶν [scil. τῶν Ἀποστόλων] λέγων, Τοῦτο ποιεῖτε εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν ἀνάμνησιν.—Lib. v. c. xix.

ποιέω means to sacrifice.¹ Had Dr. Arnold even remembered a passage of an author very familiar we should have thought to a schoolmaster, the poet Virgil, he probably might have been saved from the ill-considered remarks upon which we are now commenting. The word "facio" is used by Virgil, and many other Latin writers, as meaning to "sacrifice,"² a sense undoubtedly derived from, or rather a mere imitation of the Greek usage. But our proof of the meaning of ποιέω is not yet exhausted. There is a word of the same meaning, "to do," in Hebrew (as Dr. Brett states,) which can only be translated to sacrifice, as in the passages already quoted from the LXX translation.

Thus the sense of "do this," or offer this sacrifice, "as used in the words of Institution," is at least unquestionably tenable; the interpretation given is not an ingenious and farfetched one, as some may at first sight think, but is in strict accordance with the ordinary meaning of the Greek original. But it will be said, perhaps, that although a sacrificial interpretation may be given to our LORD's words, yet that such is not *necessarily* their interpretation; that although ποιέω may mean to "sacrifice," yet ordinarily it means "to do," according to our English translation.

Now admitting the ambiguity of this word, and that *ordinarily* it has not a sacrificial meaning, though as regards the passage before us, the interpretation of the Fathers, who all virtually, and many in express terms, have given the same meaning to our LORD's words, ought to have the greatest weight with us; yet even admitting that this objection stands in the way of a decisive and certain interpretation, we shall next show that the sense pleaded for is the only one which is tenable, and that no other interpretation of our LORD's words can be maintained. This was acutely pointed out by Dr. Brett, in his work against Hoadley.³ Brett says,

"And that the words of the Institution *τοῦτο ποιεῖτε, do this*, are to be understood in this sacrificial sense, is manifest from the command, concerning the Cup, which is '*This do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me.*' For except we understand the words in such a sense, they will be a plain tautology. '*This do ye.*' Do what? Drink this. Then the sense must be, *Drink this as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me.*⁴ What sense is this? Can we think that

¹ Ἄγετε γὰρ δὴ Μάγον οὗ σφί νόμος ἐστὶ θυσίας ποιέισθαι.—Lib. i. § 132.

² "Cum faciam vitulâ pro frugibus." (Eclog. iii. 77.) In the Variorum ed. of Virgil many other examples are given, as "Pro frugibus faciunt;" "agnâ Jovi facit;" "facere hostiâ;" "Manibus lacte fieri non vino."

³ A true Scripture account of the nature and benefits of the Holy Eucharist, in answer to a book, entitled, "A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Sacrament of the LORD's Supper," by Dr. Brett, (1736.)

⁴ Brett's meaning would, perhaps have been clearer as follows: "Drink this in remembrance of Me, as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of Me,"—in other words, "Drink this as oft as ye drink it," which is plainly a tautology.

our SAVIOUR would speak in this manner? But translate it (as I have showed the words will very probably¹ bear,) *offer this*, make an oblation or libation of this, '*as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of ME,*' and the sense is very good."²

Again, our LORD says, that the bread is to be offered as an *ἀνάμνησις*, or memorial, of Him. This word is a sacrificial one, being used of the shewbread, which was offered as a memorial before the LORD. (Levit. xxiv. 7; Numb. x. 10, LXX.) Thus the passage which we have been considering may be translated, "Offer this as a memorial sacrifice."

Our LORD also says, in His last intercessory prayer for the Apostles, in the seventeenth chapter of S. John, "For their sakes I sanctify Myself, that they also may be sanctified through the truth, i.e., for their sakes I consecrate Myself, that they also may be really (*ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*) consecrated; really by the sacrifice of CHRIST's death, as contrasted with the inferior or typical consecration of the Jewish dispensation, by the sacrifice of slain beasts. The meaning of *ἀγιάζω*, in our LORD's case, does not and cannot mean to "sanctify," being spoken of the Eternal SON, through whom the HOLY SPIRIT is given the Author of all sanctity. The word means to consecrate Himself by His atoning death to the office of the Priesthood. Such is the meaning which has been generally, both by ancient and modern writers, given to our LORD's words? But what is meant when the same language is used in reference to the Apostles? Our LORD was sanctified or consecrated that the Apostles might be really (*ἐν ἀληθείᾳ*) consecrated, or appointed, to a *real* priestly office, and not to a figurative one as that of the Jewish priesthood. Now the priestly office which was committed to the Apostles through, or on account of the sacrificial death of CHRIST, was a *real* one as distinguished from Jewish type and figure: and also *real*, on account of the Real Presence and the true offering, a spiritual and sacramental oblation of our Blessed LORD in the Eucharistic Mysteries.

The interpretation which has been given of our LORD's words will be confirmed, if we bear in mind that His last intercessory prayer must have been spoken after the institution of the Blessed Eucharist. On its conclusion He says, "Arise, let us go hence," and passed over the brook Cedron, which, as we know from the other Evangelists, immediately followed the celebration of the Holy Communion. That the early Church thought this chapter liturgical, would appear from the remarkable expression in the Apostolical Constitutions,³ and in other ancient Liturgies, that

¹ Brett, as we have seen, might and ought to have used much stronger language.

² Ibid. pp. 82, 83.

³ S. John, 'Ο Ἰησοῦς ἐπῆρε τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ εἶπε, Πάτερ, . . . compare with the "Constitutions," "Ἐν ᾗ γὰρ νυκτὶ παρείδωτο, λαβὼν ἄρτον τοῖς ἁγίοις καὶ ἁμάρτοις αὐτοῦ χερσὶν καὶ ἀναβλέψας πρὸς σέ τὸν Θεὸν αὐτοῦ

our LORD on instituting the Blessed Sacrament raised His eyes to heaven, a fact not mentioned in the first three Gospels, or related in Scripture, unless in the first verse of the seventeenth chapter. A fresh proof is thus given of the connection of this chapter with the Holy Eucharist, the institution of which having been three times related by the other Evangelists, is omitted by S. John.

RECENT SACRED POETRY.

1. *The King's Highway, and other Poems.* By F. G. LEE. London: Bosworth. 1866.
2. *The Passing Bell, and other Poems.* By Dr. MONSELL. London: Bell and Daldy. 1866.
3. *Lays of the English Cavaliers.* By J. J. DANIELL. Oxford and London: Parker. 1866.
4. *Verses for the Blind and Afflicted.* Oxford and London: Parker. 1866.

PERHAPS the reviewing of poetry is the most difficult task which falls to the lot of a conscientious critic. As God's kingdom of grace, and His kingdom of nature teem with Sacraments, so do we find this same law prevail in the realms of intellect. The intellectual life of man, in its diverse developements, is fed by sacraments,—by great intellectual ordinances, wherein an inward and spiritual grace is brought sensibly near to us, and becomes part of our very being, and by means of an outward and visible form. Such sacraments are music, painting, poetry, &c. And the review and analysis of works of this kind is complex from the very nature of the case; but chiefly are we met by difficulties of an especial character when poetry is in question. Music has its laws, whereby its works may be tested with mathematical exactness: form and colour, which have been called respectively the melody and harmony of painting, have their laws too; but when we ascend into still higher regions, and have to deal with works whose only material has been fetched from the depths of the human mind; when we enter as critics into the world of poetry, we need a great power of keen, and careful, and concentrated thought. One of our famous reviewers—we think it was Professor Wilson—used to say, that he would never pass judgment on a poem until

καὶ Πατέρα, καὶ κλάσας ἔδωκε τοῖς μαθηταῖς εἰπὼν . . . ,” (lib. viii. c. xii.) and the Romanum Missale, “pridie quam pateretur accepit panem in sanctas ac venerabiles manus suas et elevatis oculis in cœlum ad Te Deum Patrem suum omnipotentem.”

he had read it through twice, aloud. Though we cannot so far emulate the Professor's self-sacrifice, as to follow his example, this rule of his bears out our view of the great weight which lies upon any one giving judgment on the works of a poet. But, verily, if the reviewers of poetry have such a burden on them, we think it only just that the authors should bear a portion of it, and should feel that the vocation of a poet is something far too high, and far too holy to be lightly assumed. No man would venture to compose music, or to enter into the list with sculptors and artists, unless well-assured of his fitness; and so should no man dare to enter as an aspirant into that higher field of poetry, unless the thoughts within him will not be restrained, unless his song flows—as do the works of the musician and artist—from a well-nigh irresistible inspiration.

How seldom a writer of verses recognizes this vocation as a necessity, the poetical works of the present day sufficiently prove; for we find commonplace thoughts expressed in commonplace words, but measured into some sort of metre, which metre alone constitutes its title to be called poetry. The great masters of composition give as a rule for good writing—that in all that is written there should be a certain rhythm and cadence, so that perfect prose composition should be capable of being measured off into poetical metre. Certainly if we apply the converse of this rule to the majority of poems, we shall find it suit perfectly. We recently tried the experiment of writing some verses as a continuous composition, and (except that it read rather more prosy than prose compositions can generally be allowed to be) we should never have detected that it was originally poetry at all.

The four publications which lie before us represent aptly enough four distinct schools of sacred poetry,—the one in many cases trenching on the limits of another, but still distinct and separate schools. Mr. Lee may be taken as representing the most imaginative and therefore (since poetry is in question) the highest—which we may call the mystic school; Dr. Monsell takes the moral or didactic line; Mr. Daniell deals in the narrative style; and the little collection which comes last belongs to the devotional school. Occasionally as we have said the four classes are interwoven into each other, but on the whole they are clearly and distinctly represented by the four volumes before us. Now before entering upon any analysis of these works we should like to dwell for a moment on what is involved in the proposition with which we started—that poetry is a sacrament of the intellectual life. Manifestly to fulfil its province, there must be an inward life and an outward expression befitting that inward life. A true poet must then not only conceive great and beautiful thoughts, but he must have the power likewise of creating a form wherein and whereby to impart to other minds these thoughts and ideas of his. It is the union of

these two powers which makes the poet: and it is on the basis of this that we shall consider the poems before us.

Mr. Lee's main poem, "The King's Highway," while, like most of his works, it is in parts obscure and laboured and fantastic, yet contains some passages of considerable poetical power. The poem describes an old laird who has lived for self during sixty years of his life suddenly converted and beginning to seek the Highway by which he must be taken home.

"When the last Laird only, feeble and lonely,
Cannot him roam—
Never a byeway, only a Highway
Taketh him Home."—P. 11.

When the laird begins to look for the King's Highway two systems of religious faith and practice are brought before him. We are not surprised that he chooses "Our Lady of the Snows" where the Angelus rings out with tones of joy, and where

"To tell of Him Whose Word has never failed,
'Lo I am with you all days to the end,'
Still burns a lamp before the jewelled shrine:"

in preference to the miserable system which is certainly not too flatteringly depicted. At the same time why the "Angelus" and "the rosy lamp" should be taken as distinctive marks of the King's Highway is not very clear to our mind. They do not certainly constitute the essential difference between schism and the Catholic Church. However we are not going to quarrel with Mr. Lee on that point, but would rather give some passages from this, which is certainly a fine and carefully written production. It is obscure, the grammatical construction is by no means easy, and it abounds in long elaborated sentences, whose meaning it requires some pains to unravel, but none the less does it possess much beauty. We will give the description we have alluded to:

"Far up a valley, where the hills at night
Seem coronalled with stars, and deep blue skies
Are ever mirrored in a silvery lake,
Calm sleeping in the green depths of the vale,
With broad-cleft rocks, with winding paths along,
Out-jutting rudely, guide the stranger's way
Up towards a shrine—Our Lady of the Snows.

There dimly-pictured forms set forth, in truth,
For a small remnant living, loving still,
With hymn and chant and prayer and thanksgiving,
The Light of Bethlehem, the Joys and Woes
Of Him Who lived and died, and lives again,
And never more shall die.

There, when Morning breaks
 In level lines of silver in the East,
 Beyond the ever-gathering saffron clouds,
 Clear o'er the lake, deep down the pearly vale,
 And up the steep sides of the lofty rocks,
 Rings out the Angelus, with tones of joy.
 There, when the sun dispels the drifting mists,
 And the lark, quivering in the glare of noon,
 Sings sweetly songs monotonous; or when
 The stars come out to watch the valley's calm,
 As angels watched around the crib of CHRIST,
 Our Lady's bell again rings and again;
 While ever gleaming through an open door,
 In the sweet silence of that home of homes,
 To tell of Him Whose Word has never failed,
 'Lo! I am with you all days to the end,'
 Still burns a lamp before the jewelled shrine."—Pp. 25, 27.

"Four whitewashed walls, with plaster cornice round,
 Four lofty galleries and a preaching-box,
 With narrow staircases and narrower paths,
 Where blessed sounds of Gospel utterances—
 Another gospel which is not another,—
 Boom out upon the first day of the week.
 The sheep, half-washed, in-straggle at the door
 Sharp-hinged and flapping, recognising those
 With homely nod, or grin demure or broad,
 Whose backs are pushed against the upright pens,
 But faces doorwards ever when it swings.

Then rise the nasal voices. Low, and loud
 In alternations, as the hireling's voice
 Pronounces parodies of David's muse,
 While the sheep bleat it out, in varying strains,
 With silver song or guttural harmonies.
 Then, with a system and self-confidence,
 Apocalyptic visions he unfolds;
 Builds up, casts down, or well explains away;
 Levels exalted truths for earth's low plains,
 Turns inside out deep mysteries of old,
 Making the rugged pathway clear and smooth:
 Or, mystifying messages of love,
 Curses good works, and rudely damns the Pope:
 Or, dipping deeper in sectarian lore,
 Draws up the blessed doctrines of free grace,
 A modern, feeble, legless phantasm,—
 Man a machine, worked only by his God,
 A plough, a wheel; owns vegetable life:
 Is not the potter potent with his clay?
 Sure, he but does what wills he, with his own!"

Pp. 33—35.

closing passage describes the peace he found in following highway :

"Thus, within reach of God's extended hand,
Thus, within sight of CHRIST's one only Fold,
And within sound of daily Angelus,
Through all the selfish, lonely, buried years,
No fold was entered and no hand was sought,
For Him the Incarnate might have never come ;
Yet now instinctively he sought and found,
For Nature safely led to Nature's GOD.
Even as a child, in sacramental steps,
Along the Great King's Highway, well defined,
First re-creation, strengthening, sustenance,
He took his way, secure in trust and hope,
With love in germ, to where the rosy lamp
Hung in the very Presence of his GOD.
Giving himself, his will, his all, his time,
In mercy left him for the desert-tramp,
To make atonement for neglect of old ;
In penance, winning conquests over self,
By prayer to merit Corn and Wine and Oil,
By faith to see the now-loved Canaan home,
In love to live the few remaining years,—
And so found foretaste of Eternal Peace."—Pp. 41, 42.

ny of the minor poems we have met with before. We may ally call attention to "The Wanderer;" "Flowers in the ;" "Graces;" "S. Alban," which is a very spirited hymn ; Easter." A poem on Solitude is rather too suggestive of Byron's well known lines.

ing the order we have assigned to these classes of poetry onsell claims our next attention ; yet, though we placed him gh rank on the theory of the less *material* the more *poetry*, not but allow that in actual fact his writing is very far from ing our requirements. He says in his preface that his : falls far short of that high order of divine poesy after which art aspires," and the absence of pretentiousness, joined with artiness and high teaching of all he writes, disarms our m.

s very noticeable that the only subject upon which he ever ches to being poetical is that of nature. When he is teach- God or man, of metaphysics, or theology, or morality, he is ably very prosy indeed ; but birds and flowers, and all the es of external nature seem to afford him an inspiration, in oning himself to which he writes real poetry, from which we dely wakened every now and then by some bathos ; only, r, to be carried up again into the world of poetry. We help feeling these descents from poetry to matter of fact to taste. Wordsworth is always quoted in their defence, with

about as much reason as S. Paul is quoted by the dissenters. Dr. Monseil's "Ode to the Nightingales" is, in many parts, beautiful we cannot award it higher praise than by saying that some portions of it reminded us—a little—of Shelley's "Ode to a Skylark." But in the course of it we come upon

"No artful policy to please
The gardener, and preserve my peas,
Ever one moment made me prove untrue
In deed, or word, or even thought to you ;"

and such like offences against taste and poetry.

We have spoken of this ode first, though it is not by length the chief poem, because it is to us the most real poem. "The Passin Bell," from which the collection is called, is somewhat lengthy, and is well conceived; but the execution is unequal. Sometimes there are graceful and even poetical passages; but it seldom rises above the level of dulness. It is a very good sermon done into rhyme and abounding in—no doubt unconscious—plagiarisms. Tennyson says very beautifully (we quote from memory)—

"God *gives* us Love ; something to love
He *lends* us ; and when Love is grown
To fulness, that on which it throve
Falls off, and Love is left alone."

Dr. Monseil says, speaking of God's gifts—

"He gave them, that by slow degrees
Love earthly heavenly love should train;
When He the work completed sees,
May He not take them back again?"—P. 16.

In the one we have a vivid picture which lingers in the mind; in the other we have the moral proposition without the poetry.

It is no novel idea that God will help us to bring holy desire to good effect; and so Dr. Monseil says, quite truly—

"He who hath grace to will, he can
Through God's good help, have strength to do."—P. 26.

But as we read it there comes to our mind Matthew Arnold's expression of the same truth—

"Deeds in hours of insight willed
May be through hours of gloom fulfilled ;"

which, with its two key-words of "insight" and "gloom," brings perfectly before our sight an image of self-introspection and self-accusing; of great resolutions made in ardour and generosity of spirit, and carried into effect when loneliness, and darkness, and feebleness seem to obscure all the hope and energy out of which

they have been born, and in virtue of which they are still fulfilled. Dr. Monsell mildly propounds the fact, that he who wills to do right can have strength to do it; but there is no poetry, because there is no exercise of the imagination in the enunciation in rhyme of moral propositions, however useful and true they may be. And in these remarks we have pretty fairly described the whole poem: smooth and carefully written, high toned and moral throughout. We heartily wish we could award it less scanty praise.

We turn with pleasure to Mr. Daniell's volume, from which we will extract some poems that shall speak for themselves. The collection is a capital one for young people, and will help to kindle in them that love of all that is loyal, and brave, and true, which is England's great strength. In these ballads there is a vein of real poetry, not only in the selection for subjects of deeds which are in themselves eternal poems, but in the handling of them also.

As favourable specimens of the author's style, we subjoin a portion of two of the lays: the first, "The Parting of Strafford and Laud," as an example of his treatment of pathetic subjects; the second, "The Death of Sir C. Lucas and Sir G. Lisle," as illustrating the more lively style.

PARTING OF THE EARL OF STRAFFORD AND ARCHBISHOP LAUD.

"So the great heart of Strafford spoke, and when
The morn of death has come, forth to the goal
Of glory, though of death, he went—of men
Grandest and loftiest soul.

Long had he toiled and hard, and bravely won
His way through ills o'erwhelming—bold and true
No dangers quelled his soul, and duties done
Roused him to duties new.

Great in his life, great in high aims and pains;
In counsel great and weighty schemes of state;
Great in the judgment hall, and great in chains—
In death most truly great.

* * * * *

And Strafford's dying spirit pines for Laud,
Yearns for his prayer and blessing, ere he sings
His solemn Nunc Dimittis, and to God
His dread surrender brings.

Strafford and Laud—most loved, most honoured names,
Aye battling upwards in one glorious strife;
Congenial souls in life's most holy aims,
And one in death, as life.

'Then go,' he said, 'the sacred prelate tell
That I am on my journey to my grave,
I ask his prayers, and as I pass his cell,
I would his blessing crave.'

RECENT SACRED POETRY.

The man of God upraised his streaming eyes,
Thrust through the bars his trembling hands, and poured
Out of his depths of soul its anguished cries
And blessed him in the Lord.

Then backward sank upon the dungeon floor,
Breathless and faint in speechless agony—
And Strafford rose, the pang of parting o'er,
And went his way to die.

Solemn have been the partings, through all time,
Of dearest, dying friends, since death began;
But this farewell most solemn, most sublime,
Man ever took of man.

And saints have died in fire, or freely spent
Their blood to life's last drop for faith alone;
But purer soul than Strafford's never went
Before the great white throne."—Pp. 1—4.

DEATH OF SIR C. LUCAS AND SIR G. LISLE.

"'Lead Lucas forth!' Forth Lucas came,
And on the files of musqueteers
Smiled as in scorn; in step and frame
No trembling, and in soul no fears.
But, as from fields of carnage wet,
He oft had marched to victory,
Though vanquished, fettered, doomed to die,
He stands the victor-hero yet;
And cried, 'In battle's stern embrace
Oft I and death met face to face;
See now in death I death defy,
And mark how Lucas dares to die.'

He bowed his knees a little space,
With clasped hands, and eyes lift up,
And craved of Jesu parting grace
To sweeten pain's last bitter cup;
Then laid his bosom bare, and cried,
'I'm ready: rebels, do your worst!'
Fell on his face, and groaned, and died,
Pierced with four savage wounds accurst.

Haste on the murderous tragedy!
Yea, howl aloud for victims more;
And with remorseless butchery
Let Lisle be bathed in Lucas' gore.

He treads the stage of death, his eye
Glancing defiant round;
He sees his brother's body lie
Stretched on the bloody ground.

'Tis more than e'en a Lisle can bear—
 The mighty heart gives way ;
 He weeps, a man, and kneeling there
 Beside his dead, in love's despair
 Kisses the lifeless clay ;
 And sobs his requiem : ' Oh, my friend,
 My brother, thou hast reached thy goal !
 CHRIST is thy Rest ; CHRIST me defend,
 My spirit with thy spirit blend,
 'Thou peerless and unspotted soul !'

Then stands erect, the anguish past :
 And marks in lines the levelled gun—
 ' Come nearer, men.' ' Nay,' answered one,
 ' Fear not, good sir, we'll hit you fast.'
 ' Ah,' cried the warrior, ' oft in fight
 Nearer to me than now you came ;
 In field and fort, by day and night
 I met you, and you missed your aim.
 And oh, how oft, as well ye know,
 In hottest blood and deadliest strife,
 I checked my hand and spared the blow,
 And sheathed my sword and gave you life.
 I die content ; my GOD shall bring
 Grace for my soul's anneal ;
 I die for faith, for Charles my King,
 And for my country's weal.'

With invocations loud and deep,
 On JESU's blessed name,
 E'en as he prayed, he fell asleep
 When the death volley came.
 Where Lucas fell, there Lisle lay dead—
 They slept on one same gory bed.
 One in their common death ; in life
 One in the same dread, glorious strife ;
 As one to live in honour high,
 So one in mighty heart to die.
 One grave contains the sacred dead—
 Go, ponder there awhile ;
 Then say with pride, ' My country bred
 A Lucas and a Lisle.' "

The touching collection of "Hymns for the Blind" will, we doubt not, be comforting to many. They breathe a thankful and sober spirit, and are especially interesting from the fact that their author knows by experience the affliction of blindness ; so that all that is written is real and true. We subjoin a few stanzas :—

"Thy beauteous world from me is hid,
 The sky and field no brightness give :
 How long shall I thus buried live ?
 I will lie still and wait.

Pass time as slowly as it may,
 What's time to an eternal day?
 A speck of dust in sunshine's ray:
 I will lie still and wait.

If e'er I prayed on bended knee
 For glorious work to do for Thee,
 My quiet work now let me see,
 While I lie still and wait.

* * * * *
 But oh, to see Thy Face at last,
 When pain and death for aye are past,
 Shall be my hope while breath may last,
 And I lie still and wait."—P. 14.

ESSAYS ON QUESTIONS OF THE DAY.

The Church and the World: Essays on Questions of the Day. By various Writers, edited by the Rev. ORBY SHIPLEY, M.A. London: Longmans and Co.

THIS goodly volume reached us at that precise period of the month when we had to make our choice between reserving it for that fuller notice which intrinsically it so well deserves, but when all the weekly periodicals will have had their say about its contents, or just to give to it at once so much of space as the present state of our pages will admit. And various reasons combine to make us choose the latter of the two alternatives. Firstly; we wish to lose no time in commending the volume to the perusal of our readers. Secondly; there is so little in it that we do not agree entirely with that, after all, we have no occasion for making a lengthened review of the book. And thirdly; the most appropriate notice that we can take of it is to advise our readers to buy it or order it for their book clubs, as may be most convenient.

Our first acknowledgments, however, are due to the editor. Mr. Shipley has made an excellent selection, both of subjects and writers. Of all we may say that they are real "Questions of the Day," so that no one can take up the volume without finding something to interest himself in it; and there is not one subject that is not well treated—but oddly enough, the two best are the two which alone do not bear the names of their authors.

For purposes of convenience we may divide the papers under four heads:—First of all may be mentioned those which touch on what may be called the social Questions of the day—as Hospital

and Workhouse Nursing, by Dr. Meadows; Infanticide, its Cause and Cure, by Canon Humble; University Extension, by Professor Rogers. The second head of articles relates to certain doctrinal and practical Questions which could not be overlooked, as the Reunion of the Church, which Mr. Blenkinsopp is well qualified to speak of from his acquaintance with the East; the Eucharistic Sacrifice, by Mr. Medd; Positivism, by Mr. Isaac Gregory Smith; Cathedral Reform, by Mr. Mackenzie Walcott, (which, however, though full of information, scarcely fulfils the promise of its title;) and the Conscience Clause, by Canon Trevor. To this class we must refer two able Articles; on Science and Prayer, by Mr. McColl, and on Revelation and Science, by an anonymous writer. In the third class of subjects Mr. Street stands alone as the exponent of Christian Art, in an interesting sketch of the different varieties of Gothic Architecture, as found in the various countries of Europe. Under this head, had space allowed, Mr. Shipley could easily have extended his "Contents." We have reserved till last the mention of the subjects which will be of chief interest to our readers, those which are now most fiercely debated. Mr. Vaux, in a very temperate manner, advocates Clerical Celibacy—not so much on the grounds of its being the higher life, as because it would enable the priest to work the work of the Lord without distraction. Mr. Baring-Gould more violently attacks the hereditary prejudices of Churchmen by maintaining that our Prayer Book offices are unintelligible to the mass of our half-heathen poor, and require to be supplemented with short Missionary services, for which he considers that we also need Missionary brotherhoods. In the paper on Vows Mr. Carter, in a way that must shock we should think some of the supporters of Clewer, shows both their scripturalness and their value. From this paper we give an extract which is well deserving consideration :—

"It is often questioned, whether a vow adds anything to the acceptableness of the act by which the soul gives itself to God. The Schoolmen—and Roman divines generally adopt their teaching—answered this question in the affirmative. To vow a thing and do it, was ruled to be more than simply to do it, on the ground that it is not only a giving oneself to God as to the present act, but also as to the power of action in future. A favourite illustration is wont to be used in describing the difference. To give the fruit of a tree is less than to give the tree itself, together with its fruit and fructifying power. This distinction, however, would seem to hold good only in case a freedom of withdrawal from any obligation is left open. It can have no real application in the case of one placing himself in a position which in itself implies an obligation to remain. The outward circumstances, as, e.g., of one consecrated in a religious community, whose withdrawal would be deemed a scandal, or be visited with censure, must needs be equally an entire self-surrender, whether or not it be accompanied with formal vows. The willingly binding upon oneself any moral pressure,

is a practical equivalent for the formal utterance of the lips. On the principle stated, however, it is argued, that vows are of the essence of the religious life, and constitute its reality. The Schoolmen generally, as well as later Roman Divines, teach that they are the 'ordinary means of fixing oneself in the religious state, because, in order to be a state properly so called, there must be stability, permanence, which is the effect produced by vows in consequence of the obligation they impose.'

"The meaning of this statement must be, that the vow is to be considered as synonymous with permanence, or as the only security for it; otherwise such a position would be to resolve the laws of the inner life into a question of external constraint. To view the obligation as depending on the formal expression of the lips, would be to make it simply external. A state of life must necessarily depend for its permanence, not on its expression, but on the calling of GOD, Whose grace inspires and sustains it. It can only be with the idea of securing a doubtful purpose by moral force, or as regarding the engagement as matter of discipline, that the mere promise can be ruled to be of the essence of the bond. Stability is the result of an inward steadfastness, the fruit of a Divine operation. Vows must be worthless, as a hold upon the conscience, if the life which dictated them has expired. The indelibility of holy orders, or the indissolubility of marriage, do not depend on the promises made when the obligation of either state is undertaken, whatever be the form or kind of promise, but on the ordinance of GOD, instituting such states of life, known in themselves to involve their own special obligations. The state of Religion is not indeed a sacrament ordained of GOD; but it is of a kindred order of life within the sphere of supernatural grace, founded on a definite and express call, by which the HOLY GHOST makes known His will, and necessarily involving certain obligations. It is as much the Spirit's witness to the soul, as being the ordained means of its perfection, as the sacramental ordinances referred to are institutions of GOD through the same Spirit. That there is a natural desire in the soul to give utterance to its resolves—that such outward expression is in harmony with the Church's ordinary use in forming rites for the consecration of persons to states of life within its sphere—that it is a stay to the soul's consciousness of its own acts of devotion; a protection cast about the person, cutting off the possibility of change in the sight of others—and a fitting assurance to a community of the fixed purpose of its professed members—these are positions which can hardly be disputed, any more than that vows are lawful, and, if according to His will, pleasing and acceptable to GOD. But it is equally certain that, if the history of the Church, when its first love was quickened by the freshest out-pouring of the Spirit, is to be taken as an evidence of her mind, and of the mind of her GOD, sealed by the Church's witness, a tacit profession is as real an evidence of the truth of the Divine vocation, and the inner life itself the only sure ground of stability, and alone essential to its acceptance in the sight of GOD.

"It is sometimes urged that a continual self-devotion, ever renewed by ever-repeated acts, while the soul is still free to withdraw, is a more generous and self-denying sacrifice, than an act which allows no recall,

which is done once and for ever. There is no doubt a seeming attractiveness in the thought; but it is difficult to understand what is meant. In regard to a material offering, external to oneself, such a course would be simply impossible. We cannot give, while yet we retain. To retain the power of continually giving, we must be really still holding it in our possession. We have not given it, from the very fact that we still have the power of giving it. Can there be a difference in the case of giving oneself? If we continually offer ourselves, we have at all times the power of withdrawing the offering; and this very freedom, which is supposed to be deliberately retained, really makes it to be no gift. While it is still in our power, it is still our own. We may give, or not give, the very next hour. It is not that the vow constitutes the gift, but the conscious acceptance of the call of God necessarily, if it be true, involves the future equally as the present. It is of God, and partakes of His eternity. There ought, indeed, to be the utmost caution, forethought, deliberation, embracing both inward dispositions and outward duties, a spirit of self-distrust and fear, in lowliest dependence on the leadings of grace and the providence of God. And all this, moreover, accompanied with such assistance as can be attained through the guidance of those to whom the care of the soul is rightfully entrusted. But these considerations, though they greatly affect the wisdom and rectitude of the decision, are but conditions of its character, not the constituent elements of its life. It is the following of Jesus, and the being united with His life in the form which He wills to impress on the soul, which constitutes its reality, and to leave any reserve of self-choosing in the future, is but to 'keep back part of the price.'—Pp. 380—383.

Dr. Littledale, in treating of the Missionary aspect of Ritualism, appears to have used up the space allotted to him in a long introduction, and so was obliged to pass rather lightly over the proper subject of his paper. The article touches, however, on some great truths. Mr. Perry's paper on the "Reasonable Limits of Lawful Ritualism," is certainly not open to the charge of haste. We have a high opinion of the Author's legal acumen; but we much fear that it will be found that he attempts to legalise a little too much. We give, however, his conclusions:

"That, among the Ornaments and Usages which the Law so defined will sustain and sanction now, the following are supported by such adequate direct or indirect Historical Evidence as to render it sufficiently evident that they 'were used under the First Prayer Book of Edward the Sixth;' and that, not being now legally prohibited, they 'may still be used' under the present Prayer Book; viz., the ancient Vestments of the Bishops and other Clergy; the two lights on the altar; the incense; the mixed chalice; the eastward position, in front of the altar, of the priest and his assistants in the celebration of the Holy Communion."—P. 497.

The Editor concludes the series by a comparison of the Liturgies of 1549 and 1662, warning those who clamour for a revision of the

Prayer Book, that while the High Church Party deprecate change of all kinds, yet that if the Prayer Book is to be touched at all, they are prepared to demand a return to what may be called the first work of the Reformation.

There remains the Autobiographical sketch, entitled, "Thirty Years in the English Church." The narrative is intensely interesting, vividly reproducing many of the most painful and unhealthy events of the period. We do not at all, therefore, doubt its authenticity; one of its most unnatural incidents, viz., that in which the Author was directed to pray for sickness, if she had acted wrongly—having all the marks of verisimilitude. It is the work, undoubtedly, of a crushed spirit, but scarcely we should think the work of a woman.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Christian Sacrifice. A Sermon preached in S. George's Church, Dublin, on Feb. 16, 1866, by the Rev. ARTHUR A. DAWSON, Incumbent of S. Bartholomew's, Dublin. Hodges and Smith.

THIS is a truly admirable sermon, the force of which will not be lost by its withdrawal from circulation, as a peace-offering. On the contrary, the Protestants of Dublin may be certain that much more attention has been drawn to the subject by their opposition, than if they had let the sermon alone.¹ The Archbishop in counselling the step of withdrawing it for the sake of peace, carefully abstained from uttering the least question respecting its perfect orthodoxy. In fact the sermon is most carefully and guardedly written, and we are glad to see that the Protestant feeling of Dublin has now taken to show itself more boldly in its true colours, by proceeding to acts of personal violence in its hatred of Catholicity. Perhaps this will render Archbishop Trench more shy of attempting conciliation in future, when the truth of GOD is really at stake. Mr. Dawson's own church we see is still incomplete, and we trust that Catholics will do what they can to assist him in the very important work of propagating the truth in the adverse soil of Ireland. We give one extract, as the sermon is now not easy to be met with.

"CHRIST is a Priest for ever. The Sacrifice was *slain* at one particular period: and when the Redeemer bowed His head at the ninth hour on Good Friday, He cried, 'It is finished;' but the offering of that Sacrifice is enduring and eternal in heaven.

"S. John in his apocalyptic vision, 'saw before the throne of GOD a *Lamb* as it had been slain.' What Lamb was that, but 'the Lamb of GOD, that taketh away the sins of the world?' 'Lift up your hearts'—fix your thoughts on CHRIST in Heaven. There He abides a High Priest continually, and

¹ The first result of the suppression of the sermon was its publication *in extenso* by one of the Dublin papers.

offers still the same perfect sacrifice, that is, still represents it to His heavenly FATHER as consummated once in order to never ending results. He is the 'one Mediator between GOD and man;' His human form, bearing, even in glory, the marks of the cross and spear, is ever before the FATHER's face, and 'in Him GOD is well pleased.'

"He prays for His people, though the FATHER Himself loves them. He prays for His enemies, as He did at Calvary. Myriads of holy ones bend round that majestic form, rapt in adoring wonder. They look with winged gaze on that mysterious sight—for He Who prays is GOD, although in human flesh! Therefore, 'the living creatures and the elders fall down before the Lamb,' and all the holy angels with them; the 'ten thousand times ten thousand and thousands of thousands; saying, Worthy is the Lamb that was slain, to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing.' (Rev. v.) This is what is ever going on above: this is the worship of heaven.

"III. But I must carry your thoughts one step further. I must remind you that what He is doing there, His ministers are bid to *do here*. The worship of the Church below is a copy of that above. As CHRIST above is honouring His FATHER, and making continual intercession for His people, by representing perpetually His one finished sacrifice; so His priests on earth offer up the same sacrifice to GOD, the sacrifice of the cross, in that commemorative rite which the LORD has appointed.

"'This do in remembrance of Me'—for a memorial of Me. A memorial to whom? To *man* only? Nay, verily, but also to GOD Almighty. 'As oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the LORD's death till He come.' Show forth to whom? To each other? Nay, not merely so, but to the Eternal FATHER also; that He may 'look upon the covenant;' that 'when He sees the blood of our Paschal Lamb, He may pass over us,' and spare us for the sake of the SON of His love, Whose atonement we plead as our only hope.

"This is the highest, holiest view of the Eucharist. There are other ways in which it may be rightly regarded; but this is the chiefest and first of all. It is the great act of Christian worship; it gives virtue to all the rest."—Pp. 6—8.

We have read the *Mystery of Bethlehem*, by the Rev. W. BAIRD, (Hayes, London,) with great satisfaction. Considering its size it is one of the clearest expositions of the vast and all-comprehensive doctrine of the Incarnation that we remember to have read: and that which makes it particularly valuable and useful is, that it not only shows the doctrine to be the great foundation of all truth, the "battle field of the Church," and its non-appreciation the starting point of all dispute and heresy, but he also compares the views of the two leading schools of thought on the subject of the Incarnation, viz., (1) the Thomist view, (from S. Thomas Aquinas,) which is expressed in the words of S. Augustine, "If man had not sinned the Son of Man had not come;" (2) the view of Duns Scotus, which was diametrically opposed to that of Aquinas, viz., that the SON of GOD would have become incarnate irrespectively of the fall; so that if man had resisted the devil, it was the counsel of GOD to raise him to a higher level by the Incarnation of His eternal SON. The former of the opinions, in common with all the best theologians, is that set forth by Mr. Baird. We hope that this little book will have a large circulation, for being clearly the production of one who has a true grasp of the verities of the laws of the kingdom

of the Incarnation—of the principle of Divine strength being hidden in human weakness, it cannot fail in showing how truly this grand truth underlies all GOD's dealings, all the sacraments and ordinances of the Church; how, in fact, the Church herself, as a whole, is the Bride of CHRIST, His Flesh and His Bones, the Body in which CHRIST abides in His fulness.

If recent controversies have necessitated the study of the question of Inspiration, as most persons will think to be the case, the Rev. T. S. ACKLAND's *Short Summary of the Evidences for the Bible*, (Parker,) will be found very useful for the purpose. It is clearly and systematically written, and embodies all the points of chief importance.

Mr. CHARLES WALKER has chosen a favourable moment for publishing a Translation of the Ordinary and Canon of the Liturgy according to the Use of the Church of Sarum, which is appropriately dedicated to the Bishop of Salisbury, (Hayes.) The translation is carefully done, and is accompanied by a useful body of notes. In the preface also Mr. Walker discusses several points of interest, as, e.g., the sequence of colours and the classification of feasts. There are also some valuable remarks on the changes of custom relating to the celebration. In primitive times there was only one celebration in the day, at which all persons communicated: then when the faithful found themselves often unable to attend, they were allowed the privilege of carrying the Sacrament home. In the middle ages there grew up a development which Mr. Walker calls "the exact reverse" of the former, according to which the body of persons attended habitually at what came to be called High Mass, without communicating.

The Story of the Cross, in Daily Contemplations for the Holy Week, by Canon TREVOR, (Mozleys,) has a good deal that is original in it, at the same time that it avoids all that is questionable in doctrine.

There is much of quiet, religious sentiment in Mr. HUTCHINSON's *Holy Thoughts and Musings of a Departed Friend*, (Masters.) The little work is dedicated to the Bishop of Oxford.

Sermons preached in the Chapel of Cheltenham College, by the Rev. ALFRED BARRY, D.D., Principal, (Bell and Daldy,) are a very favourable specimen of theology adapted to boys. In saying this, we do not mean to give an unqualified approval to all that is contained in this thick volume: for example, we have the double view of Confirmation given; but as a whole the sermons are satisfactory in doctrine, and above the average in ability.

Conversations on the History of England, edited by the Rev. J. BAINES, (Masters,) is a good attempt to place the History of England before the minds of children; but we are not at all sure that it is any the better for its conversational form. The genealogical and chronological tables are well arranged, and may be useful to older children than the juvenile scholars for whom it seems primarily to be designed. We may add, that the editorship of itself, however, would ensure that it is to be depended on in Church matters, though these are not brought very prominently forward.

A FEW WORDS ON THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PATRONAGE.

(Communicated.)

It is now very generally admitted that the extension of the Episcopate is pre-eminently calculated to promote the objects aimed at by the establishment of the Church. For although there are other measures which must be resorted to, if we would do all that we can to bring the Church to bear upon the masses, and some, perhaps, which may be made use of with more telling effect in certain isolated instances, there is no one which will secure to us so much benefit as this, as there is no one that is so interwoven with the supervision of her machinery, which is, after all that we can say or do, the great thing that we have to look at. Fifteen or twenty thousand clergy cannot be safely launched upon the kingdom without a ruler, neither will twenty or thirty men be sufficient to rule them; nor can the difficulties they will have to meet amongst twenty millions of people be surmountable with no more of overseeing power than was applied when we had not above the fifth of that population. There must be more master minds to be set at work, if the Church is to discharge her functions as she ought; more of regulation, if not of constraint, just as there is more of difficulty; and this we cannot have if we have not more bishops; and, if we are to speak the whole truth, more good bishops than we have at present.

Although three centuries ago there were as many bishops as now, (for although two new sees have been created, two also have disappeared either wholly or as separate sees,) it may be allowed perhaps that there was more than a sufficiency until within a very few years of the present time, because the cares of a bishop then wandered chiefly from his wig to his gaiters, and he had very little ecclesiastical work to do; and such was the state of the Church and of the public feeling with regard to her true position, that if a live bishop had appeared he would have been sent to the Zoological Gardens, or a fuss would have been made about him, just as there is now about vestments and incense. But we have changed all that sort of thing, and bishops are now expected to work, and encouraged to do so: and in this more happy state of affairs it will not do to keep down their number to the minimum allowed in the time of Henry VIII., when our population was only four millions. Nay, at that time it was proposed that twenty new sees should be erected, instead of the six that were actually created, and that there should be twenty-six suffragan bishops besides; so that our present number is absolutely ridiculous.

Vol. XXVIII.—JULY, 1866.

2 s

If, too, we make a comparison between our own and foreign countries, no less a truth will burst upon us than has been elicited by the comparison of ourselves with ourselves at different periods of our history; for we find from authentic documents quoted in the first report of the cathedral commissioners, that in 1854 France had a bishop for every 400,000 souls; Bavaria, eight for 3,000,000 catholics, or one to 375,000; Austria, sixty-eight for 28,000,000 catholics, or one for 358,000; Spain, fifty-nine for 12,000,000, or one for 203,000; Portugal, twenty-two for 2,500,000 catholics, or one to 113,000; the Sardinian States, forty for 4,600,000, or one for 110,000; the two Sicilies, eighty for 8,500,000 souls, or one to 106,000; Sweden, thirteen for 3,000,000, or one to 230,000; and Free Greece, twenty-four to less than 1,000,000, or about one to 41,000; while England and Wales have twenty-eight bishops to 20,205,000, or one to 748,000 persons; and then we find that America has thirty-two episcopal sees to 1800 clergy, while England and Wales have twenty-eight only to 18,000.

While, however, the total inadequacy of our present number of bishops to the wants of the Church and the people is readily acknowledged, there is not so general an agreement as to the method to be pursued for the procurement of the desired increase; and as long as this shall be the case, it will be all but impossible to hope for any great advance toward its attainment. We must have done with the little peddling attempts at amendment that have been made, and which, if they had succeeded, would have driven off for a long time the full redress which we have a right to, and take to a wider policy: it is only by looking the difficulty in the face, and determining fully to surmount it, that we shall get on. We do not want a bishopric for Cornwall or Nottingham alone, neither would the case be met by the addition to them of the bishoprics of S. Alban's and Westminster: we want forty-eight new sees at least; and even then our bishops will have a territory of about 485,000 square acres each to superintend, which is quite as much as a man should have if he is to do his duty.

But if, as we know, the advisers of the crown were frightened at the probable cost of five bishops, it may be thought to be hopeless to think of a number amounting nearly to fifty. And so it would be, if they were to have £4,000 or £5,000 per annum each, and this sum were to be made a charge upon the funds of the ecclesiastical commission. But there is no necessity for any such income as this, and no necessity for taking the amount, whatever it may be, from the coffers of the commissioners. We may leave their fund to be applied to the purposes they have adopted, and yet have a full staff of bishops, and we may provide chapters besides at a cost to them which would not be worth a cavil. For a mere fraction of the profits that accrue to them from one day to another, *we may do all that we want, provided only we will consent to re-*

trace our steps to a trifling extent, and modify our present system, so as to put it more upon a level with our wants than with the mere aggrandisement of a handful of bishops, who after this was effected, could not do what they should, by reason of the extent of their territory.

The misfortune is that when the excitement was raised about thirty years ago against the chapters, and it was determined to overhaul them and the bishoprics as well, the powers that then existed did not content themselves with supplementing the incomes of the poorer bishops, but set about enlarging the incomes of the majority of the sees, by the means of the funds at their command, which would have been better applied to the former of these purposes first, and then to the foundation of new sees, (to the extent of the sums that were actually used in the enlargement of the incomes of the other bishops,) and the consequent diminution of the territory that was left to each. It is probable, however, that as at that time bishops had not been resuscitated, and the exceptional few that were inclined to be active were always sure to be snubbed, it was not thought that the extent of territory was matter for serious consideration; and hence we have nineteen out of twenty-eight bishops with over a million of square acres to go over, and of these four with above two millions. The figures are as follows;—Gloucester, 1,000,503; Worcester, 1,037,451; Bath and Wells, 1,043,059; S. Asaph, 1,067,585; Peterborough, 1,240,327; Salisbury, 1,309,617; Ely, 1,357,765; Oxford, 1,385,779; Rochester, 1,535,450; Ripon, 1,567,793; Winchester, 1,598,568; Chester, 1,630,988; Lichfield, 1,740,607; Durham, 1,906,835; Norwich, 1,994,525; York, 2,261,493; S. David's, 2,272,790; Lincoln, 2,302,814; Exeter, 2,530,780. Now if the plan which will be submitted were adopted, our bishoprics would be about equal in extent to the County of Surrey, which has 485,120 acres within its limits, and all this excess of acreage would be got rid of.

It is plain from what has been said, that war will have to be made upon the incomes of the bishoprics now in existence, but without their consent no attack would be made upon the funds of the present incumbents, as but for their own relief no diminution would be required; and as even this need not be had unless they wish it, no harm would be inflicted upon them. The alterations that will be proposed may be as gradually made as were those which have been made in the chapters, and with as little effect upon the existing incumbents as in their instances; that is the whole amount of the mischief, at least as far as they are concerned. A little liberty would have to be taken with the patronage of the Church, but no more than is actually required; and as this would not be confined to the modification of the privileges of the government, but be extended to that of other public bodies and persons as well,

the scheme cannot be looked upon as an attack upon the higher powers. The recommendations that will be made, will be made in the interests of the Church, without favour to any, and though of course some prejudices must be encountered, substantial justice will be found done to all. If we alter the incomes of the bishops to get a greater number to come to the aid of the Church, no great fuss need be made if we modify the patronage of the government to secure a greater number of good bishops; and if we thus take liberties with the higher orders in Church and State, no great umbrage need be taken by the lower orders at any subsequent dealing with them, to put the Church into the position she should hold. But we will go into the appointment of new bishops first, and leave the less dignified part of the matter to be discussed afterwards, prefacing, however, what we shall have to say with the declaration that as soon as we have provided a sufficient system of checks, we shall go no further with our reforms, the object being not to alter our present system for nothing, but to ensure the fair working of the Church through the means that will be submitted for approval.

We have said that forty-eight new sees would be required, if the bishops are hereafter not to be burdened with too extensive a territory, and also that it is desirable that those that should be appointed should be good men, by which we mean not amiable men alone, or learned men alone, (although such as these we have not always succeeded in getting,) but active men, fit for the discharge of the functions of a bishop over a territory not too large to work; and for this end we should want other machinery to be put in motion than we now have.

There is no need to take anything at all from the First Lord of the Treasury, so far as the appointment to our present bishoprics is concerned, but others must be let in to share in the new appointments; and while all who have anything to do with the recommendation must, of course, be under the ultimate control of the Crown, the advisers of the Crown and the other parties to whom the office of recommendation should be committed, should be distinct and allowed only to exercise their privilege by the side of each other. We would have the twenty-eight bishoprics already existing filled up exactly as they are now, (with, however, as much better men as possible,) but we would have others appointed by other persons, with some few additions on the present plan, so as that the two classes may mutually act upon each other. We would add nine to our present number of baronial bishops, (making with Sodor and Man and another for the Channel Isles, thirty-eight to be appointed by the Crown,) without, however, increasing the number of seats in the House of Lords; and we would have, as soon as the opportunity should offer, thirty-eight *others to be elected by the clergy over whom they should preside,*

and provide emoluments for them out of a redistribution of the episcopal and decanal revenues, and the appropriation, in some few instances, of parochial benefices to their sustenance. For there is no reason why the bishop should not be the dean of his own cathedral, and many reasons why he should be; such as are to be found in the security of the integrity of his supervision of his diocese, through the means of the control of the cathedral with its clergy, and his presence with them in the example to be set to the other clergy. For the cathedral ought not to be an exotic, or a refuge for the destitute, and much less an almshouse for the sons of the great or their dependants, but a centre to the whole diocese, working in its own city so as to be seen by all, and not simply within its own walls; and in it the diocesan clergy should assemble at stated periods for prayer, to be followed by the discussion of Church topics within its precincts. It is from this place that the bishop should speak when he wants his voice to be heard, and here that the clergy should speak also, as necessity should come upon them to speak collectively. For we are not to think that bishops, however appointed, can have a monopoly of knowledge, or that their clergy cannot assist them by their counsel: and although this truth is already beginning to be felt, a more perfect machinery should be provided for the promotion of mutual consultation. Ruridecanal meetings may be very well adapted for sectional discussions, and for the communication from the bishop to his clergy of topics for ventilation, and the report to him of isolated decisions upon these subjects, but larger meetings are necessary for the removal of discrepancies in practice, and collisions from opposing decisions, and the harmonizing, as far as can be effected, of thought: and the cathedral city is the proper place for this, and where there is room for this, the cathedral precincts.

The new sees to be erected, and to be appointed by the Crown would seem to be Liverpool, Bristol, Westminster, Windsor, Wolverhampton, Southwell, Beverley, Coventry, and S. Alban's, with peerages annexed, and the Channel Isles without: and the thirty-eight to be filled up, (except as hereinafter to be excepted,) by the elections of the clergy should be Rothbury and Hexham, Northumberland; Whitehaven (with the title of S. Bees'), Cumberland; Appleby, Westmoreland; Darlington, Durham; Whitby, Bridlington and Wakefield, Yorkshire; Lancaster, Lancashire; Shrewsbury and Ludlow, Shropshire; Chesterfield, Derbyshire; Stafford, Staffordshire; Leicester, Leicestershire; Northampton, Northamptonshire; Boston and Grantham, Lincolnshire; Aylesbury, Buckinghamshire; Bedford, Bedfordshire; Swaffham, Norfolk; Bury S. Edmund's and Ipswich, Suffolk; Chelmsford, Essex; Winchelsea, Sussex; Southwark, Surrey; Caerleon, Monmouthshire; Christchurch, Hampshire; Devizes, Wiltshire; Sherborne, Dorsetshire; Dartmouth and Chumleigh, Devonshire; Bodmin and

Launceston, Cornwall; Wrexham, Denbighshire; Montgomery, Montgomeryshire, North Wales; and Brecon, Brecknockshire; Lampeter, Cardiganshire; and Laugharne, Caermarthenshire, South Wales: the dioceses in each case to be adapted to the wants of the neighbourhood, and not necessarily to be coextensive with the counties or parts of counties mentioned.

The following would, perhaps, be the best method of conducting the election to these bishoprics. Every rural dean, within the confines of the diocese to be erected, should summon the clergy of his deanery resident within the boundaries of the new diocese, to a meeting to be holden for the purpose of selecting a clergyman, who should have been an incumbent for five consecutive years at least in some part of the new diocese, and who should still be serving in it, and returning the name of the person selected to the archdeacon, to be placed by him in a list to be made up of the names returned from the several rural deaneries. Copies of this list should then be sent back to all the ruridecanal chapters, for the names to be arranged, in the order of preference shown by each, in fresh lists to be sent back to the archdeacon; with the understanding that the value of the votes given should be in inverse ratio to the order of the names: so as that, if there were ten rural deaneries, and ten separate candidates returned, the name placed first in the list should be deemed to have ten votes, and that which should be placed last, one vote. And the archdeacon should, upon the receipt of these lists, add all the votes given for each person together, and return the name of the one who should have most votes to the archbishop of the province, who should submit it to the Crown for approval, and after receiving the necessary authority should proceed to consecration; the new bishops to do homage to the Crown in like manner as the baronial bishops, and to receive the title of Lord, use the names of their sees, and have the same powers and privileges as the other bishops, with the exception of the succession to seats in the House of Lords.

In this manner we should have seventy-six bishops; thirty-eight to be appointed by the Crown, as at present, and thirty-eight to be elected by the clergy; and as there could be little doubt that none but the best men would be selected by the latter, a check would at once be put on the thrusting of incompetent persons on the Church by the former: for comparisons would be made, and it would not do for any examination of this sort to turn out to the prejudice of the Government. This, however, would not be the only advantage to be gained. For although the Crown would be free to select its bishops from any quarter, it would be sometimes perhaps induced to make choice of some one or other of the representative bishops for elevation to the baronial bishoprics, as men should prove themselves fit to be treated in this manner by the *discharge* of their functions in the lower office: and thus men of

talent would be brought forward, who could not, but for such an arrangement as this, have a chance, and the Church and the nation would profit by it. For that many men who would make good bishops are passed over now from want of being known cannot be denied, while many that are unfit for the office are put into it; anomalies which ought not to be possible.

But we have forty-eight new bishops to find incomes for, for bishops are gastronomic animals, and must be fed; and this, perhaps, will stagger the most stout-hearted reader, as amongst things difficult certainly, if not impossible. The baronial bishops, however, will have great relief granted them in their work and their expenditure, and (as long as vested interests are respected) may be made to contribute to our help. It is thought, too, that some of those who have rights of this nature will be glad to compound for the relief to be gained by the cession of a part of their revenues; and if this be so, vacancies will not in every case have to be waited for, but we might proceed at once in some. And by way of a stimulus to this, we would give the first appointment to any bishop who would supply a sufficient endowment for a new diocese to be formed out of his own; provided he should nominate to the archbishop a person who should have served five years at least as an incumbent in the portion of it that was to be separated, and should be still resident and serving in it; and suspend the elective powers of the clergy until the removal of the bishop's nominee. The territory of some of our present bishoprics is sufficiently large to make it worth their while to enter into such an arrangement as this; and therefore it may not be so impracticable as some might otherwise be inclined to think.

In some dioceses, also, more new bishoprics than one will have to be formed, and more than could be supplied with incomes from the revenues of the present bishopric. In these cases an additional inducement might be offered to the incumbent of the mother see to consent to the immediate division of his bishopric, in the shape of an engagement to complete the whole of the arrangements as to his territory as soon as funds could be got from other sources, so as to give him as much compensation as possible for his consent. In this case it would be necessary to stipulate that he be reduced in regard to his income to the same point as his see would eventually be allowed to remain at, were it left to be cut down on his removal from it to some other sphere; the understanding being that he should not appoint to more bishoprics than he found incomes for, so as that the privilege of the clergy with regard to election should not be suspended or interfered with further than would be necessary for the earlier introduction of the new bishoprics through the acquisition of the necessary means from the present incumbents, and the transference of them from these to those.

Not that there would be very much of sacrifice to be encountered by those of our present bishops who would be in a position to effect the good we have just spoken of for the Church, as no slight alteration would be made in their position in relation to their now-a-days necessary expenditure. For the charities and hospitalities of a bishop, and his travelling and other contingent expenses must be in proportion to the extent of his territory, and the population comprised within it; and it would be no great hardship for a man who has now £4,500 per annum, and a territory of a million and a half of acres, and a population of half a million, to be reduced to £3,000 per annum on the reduction of his territory and population to one-third of their present extent, or even to only half that amount; though in more than one case the larger reduction would be effected, and in some instances the relief to the bishop would be even greater. The plan here advocated would reduce the territory of every bishop to about half a million of acres, and the income of the baronial bishops, except in the cases that will hereafter be pointed out, to £3,000 per annum; and we should fix the incomes of the representative bishops at £1,500 per annum, which latter amount, it will be recollected, has already been pronounced by Convocation to be sufficient for suffragan bishops not being encumbered with peerages.

In advocating such a reduction of episcopal incomes we by no means put out of sight the need of exercising hospitality; but large incomes do not, in our judgment, encourage bishops, any more than they do other *magnates* of the land, to see much of their neighbours. On the contrary, it is notorious that persons who can afford to do so like to fill their houses with friends from a distance, and are just those who give the cold shoulder to the country clergy or the laity who are content to live at home. And so it happens that wealth generally tempts its possessor to neglect the Christian duty of hospitality, and in its stead to indulge in mere selfish extravagance.

At present we have in England and Wales two archbishops with the rank of dukes, twenty-five bishops with that of barons, and a bishop without a peerage in the Isle of Man; and their united incomes amount to £157,200 per annum; and we think that a sum of £51,700 may be ultimately got from this source in aid of the fund to be formed for the erection of additional bishoprics. But as of this we should apportion £31,500 to the baronial sees that we propose to found, a sum only of £20,200 would be available for the thirty-eight representative bishops and that in the Channel Islands; and if we put these at £1,500 per annum each, we should want in all £58,500, and therefore have a deficiency to make up of £38,300 per annum. This, however, would not create any difficulty; for we have already said that there is no ostensible reason

why the bishops should not be made deans also of their cathedrals, or, in other words, that the deaneries should be suppressed, and their emoluments and duties be transferred to the bishops, who should thereupon be called upon to cede an equal amount of their former episcopal revenues in aid of the fund for the new bishoprics. And if we do this, (except in the cases of Oxford and Durham, as being connected with the universities,) we *believe* that we shall get from this source a further sum of £35,800; and so we shall have £2,500 to provide, which we would make up from livings in public patronage, to be assigned to the archbishops of the two provinces for the endowment of such of the representative bishoprics as would not be otherwise provided for: and from these livings those of course would be selected which might happen to be situated in the towns which are to form the seats of the new dioceses. From the same source also we should get the endowments for four new archdeaconries, for at present there are only seventy-two archdeacons; and as under the proposed plan there would be seventy-six dioceses, four more of these officers would be wanted.

No very great inroad, then, would be made upon the public patronage by the arrangements recommended for the supply of the deficiency in the endowments of the new bishoprics, after the absorption of the deaneries that have been spoken of, and for the creation of the new archdeaconries. But there is another point upon which we must now touch, and that is, the formation of chapters for the new sees; and this is a matter which is certainly not unattended by difficulty, for there would be forty-six sees that would require to be aided in this manner.

If we are to suppose that there should be (as in our present cathedrals) four canons only in each new cathedral church, and that these should be elected from among the beneficed clergy, who should be allowed to retain their old benefices, there would be no occasion for any large separate endowment; all that would be required would be an allowance for extraordinary expenses. But if it be alleged that the real thing to aim at is the permanent residence of the canons in the cathedral towns, (which is unquestionably the most perfect arrangement,) then separate incomes would be required for the canons, and a considerable allowance also for the rest of the cathedral staff. But this ought not to create a difficulty. For a moderate tax upon tithe-rent charges would be more than sufficient to produce all that would be wanted, and not a penny need be asked for from the laity who might not happen to possess tithes. Nor need any expense be incurred in the collection of the amount, whatever it might be, that would be required; for it might be paid through the officials of Queen Anne's Bounty, without any additional cost.

At the date of the last return made by the Tithe Commissioners
VOL. XXVIII. 2 T

for England and Wales, the total sum awarded to the owners of tithes was £4,053,019. 12s. 5½d. And this sum was divided out in the following proportions:—

	£.	s.	d.
To Clerical Appropriators and Lessees	678,676	11	1½
„ Lay Impropriators	766,082	4	4½
„ Schools, Colleges, &c.	196,056	15	0½
	£1,640,815	10	7
„ Parochial Incumbents	2,412,204	1	10½
	£4,053,019	12	5½

Now if we were to put a tax of £6 per cent. upon the first three classes, and of £3 per cent. upon the last, we should have more than sufficient to find incomes for our forty-six cathedrals at £3,686 per annum each; and the sums to be produced by these several classes might be graduated, if wished, so as that they should fall lighter upon the poorer members of them; and this at no immoderate increase in the charge to the richer. It cannot, however, at present be said what changes would be necessary to be made in order to do this, as there are no returns of tithes according to scales of income; and therefore we can only speak with confidence of the sums to be produced in the aggregate.

It may appear unequal to fix the payments in respect of the appropriate and impropriate tithes at double the percentage to be paid by the incumbents; but as their owners bear no share in the duties and charities of the parishes whence they derive their incomes, and they have very generally evaded the gift of the *congrua portio* that they were always expected to give to their vicars, who have all these things to look to, it does not seem at all unfair that they should contribute in that *ratio*. And it must be remembered that a precedent for this is to be found in the income tax, which allows farmers to be rated at half only of their actual rents, and so gives them an advantage of 50 per cent. over their landlords, upon grounds very similar to those that have been mentioned.

The £3,686 would provide incomes for the following staff:—

Four canons at £525 each	£2,100
Precentor and head master of school	160
Succentor and second master	150
Organist and choirmaster	140
Assistant organist and travelling choirmaster	100
Twelve singing-men at £52	624
Twelve choristers at £30	360
Verger and porter	52
	£3,686

The above list does not show the whole income of the precentor and succentor, who would be supposed to gain a considerable profit in their capacity of schoolmasters; and as the sum of £360 put down for choristers would be paid to the organist for the board and lodging of the boys, he would also have some profit to look to from that source. The travelling choirmaster's income would also be supplemented by fees to be paid out of a fund to be raised in the parishes requiring his aid, and which would connect themselves with the cathedral, in order to have the benefit of his supervision and instruction for their choirs.

But in whatever way the chapters might be formed, and whether upon the principle of separate endowment or not, we should recommend that, both in the new and the old chapters, some alteration should be made in the capitular arrangements. We would have the chapter to consist of six members, under the presidency of the bishop—the archdeacon and the chancellor, (to be appointed, as at present, by the bishop,) and the four canons; and we would have the last-mentioned officers elected, two and two, by the clergy and laity of the diocese, (or rather by such of the laity as should have communicated three times during the previous twelvemonth,) out of the beneficed clergy of the diocese, of at least three years' standing; who should (if the fuller system of endowment were adopted) be required to resign their old preferment, but should be allowed to retain it if the minor scheme were preferred. The six persons thus appointed would then form a kind of council to the bishop, and from their origin would be enabled to give him the most valuable assistance in the discussion of points of general interest to the diocese, and to prepare them for more perfect ventilation in those cases in which it might appear expedient that larger information should be elicited. For in this way the clergy and laity would both be represented, which is not the case now, as the capitular offices are not in their patronage, and are filled up in some instances by people who do not care very much about either. It ought, however, to be understood that none of the proceeds of any tax of the nature that has been pointed out should be allotted to the purpose of the payment of the canons or other officers, until after houses of residence of moderate size should have been found for all but the singing-men out of its produce; and that in the case of the larger scheme being adopted, no benefice should be appropriated as an endowment which is not situated in the cathedral town. If, however, the smaller scheme should be preferred, it would be obvious that such a limitation as this would become inoperative; and the whole range of the benefices in the diocese would then be capable of yielding endowments, as the incumbents of them might be selected by the electors that have been mentioned.

The following tables will show how the £51,700 are to be got from the present bishoprics; what places should be made the seats of the baronial and non-baronial sees to be appointed by the Government; and what is to be the income of each:—

No. 1.—PRESENT AND FUTURE INCOMES OF THE ARCHBISHOPRICS AND BISHOPRICS OF ENGLAND AND WALES NOW IN EXISTENCE.

Sees.	Present.	Future.	Sees.	Present.	Future.
Canterbury . . .	15,000	12,000	Brought forward	94,200	63,000
York	10,000	8,000	Lichfield	4,500	3,000
London	10,000	6,000	Lincoln	5,000	3,000
Durham	8,000	5,000	Llandaff	4,200	3,000
Winchester . . .	10,000	5,000	Manchester . . .	4,200	4,500
Bangor	4,200	3,000	Norwich	4,500	3,000
Bath and Wells .	5,000	3,000	Oxford	5,000	3,000
Carlisle	4,500	3,000	Peterborough . .	4,500	3,000
Chester	4,500	3,000	Ripon	4,500	3,000
Chichester . . .	4,200	3,000	Rochester	5,000	3,000
Ely	5,500	3,000	Salisbury	5,000	3,000
Exeter	5,000	3,000	S. Asaph	4,200	3,000
Gloucester . . .	5,000	3,000	S. David's	4,500	3,000
Hereford	4,200	3,000	Sodor and Man .	2,000	2,000
			Worcester	5,000	3,000
Carried forward	94,200	63,000		157,200	105,500
			Balance		51,700
					157,200

No. 2.—LIST OF BARONIAL SEES TO BE APPOINTED TO BY THE CROWN.

Sees.	Incomes.	Sees.	Incomes.
Liverpool	4,500	Brought forward	19,500
Bristol	4,500	Southwell	3,000
Westminster . . .	4,500	Beverley	3,000
Coventry	3,000	S. Alban's	3,000
Windsor	3,000	Wolverhampton .	3,000
Carried forward	19,500		31,500

No. 3.—NON-BARONIAL SEE TO BE APPOINTED TO BY THE CROWN.

See.	Income.
Channel Islands . . .	1,500

It is to be remembered, however, that if we would have all the benefits that we can from the reinforcement to our staff of bishops by these appointments, and the elections that have been before spoken of, the boundaries of the provinces of Canterbury and York should be re-arranged; for at present there are under 9,100,000 acres in the latter province, while there are above 27,500,000 in the former, not including Sodor and Man and the Channel Isles. If, however, we divide the provinces by a line running from the mouth of the river Dovey, between North and South Wales, and along the southern boundaries of Herefordshire, Worcestershire, Warwickshire, Northamptonshire, and the south-eastern corner of Lincolnshire into the Wash, we shall have 18,484,920 square acres in the province of Canterbury, and 18,862,612 in that of York; and we shall have one archbishop and seventeen baronial bishops and one non-baronial bishop, and nineteen representative bishops in each province; so as that the two provinces would be equalized as near as may be in point of extent, and in each province the Crown appointments and those of the clergy would be exactly balanced. The two houses of Convocation in the two provinces would also be put into a shape more conducive to the facilitation of discussion, and so yield up their benefit to the Church; and if Lichfield were used as a place for conference whenever closer communion might be required between the two provinces, we should have a much better arrangement than at present.

The following tables will show the counties in each province, and their acreage, with the position of the several sees; supposing, that is, that this recommendation is carried out:—

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY.

Counties.	Acres.	Crown Appointments.	Clerical Appointments.
Cardiganshire . . .	377,600	Lampeter
Pembrokeshire . . .	345,600	S. David's
Cardiganshire . . .	623,360	Laugharne
Radnorshire . . .	249,600
Brecknockshire . . .	512,000	Brecon
Glamorganshire . . .	422,400	Llandaff
Monmouthshire . . .	318,720	Caerleon
Gloucestershire . . .	805,120	Gloucester
"	Bristol
Wiltshire	882,560	Salisbury	Devizes
Dorsetshire	643,200	Sherborne
Somersetshire	1,050,880	Wells
Devonshire	1,650,500	Exeter	Dartmouth
"	Chamleigh
Carried forward	7,881,540		

PROVINCE OF CANTERBURY—*continued.*

Counties.	Acres.	Crown Appointments.	Clerical Appointments.
Brought forward	7,881,540		
Cornwall	849,280	Bodmin
"	Launceston
Oxfordshire	481,280	Oxford
Berkshire	464,500	Windsor
Hampshire	1,041,920	Winchester	Christchurch
Buckinghamshire	473,600	Aylesbury
Huntingdonshire	236,800
Bedfordshire	296,320	Bedford
Cambridgeshire	549,120	Ely
Herts	337,920	S. Alban's
Middlesex	180,480	London
"	Westminster
Norfolk	1,338,880	Norwich	Swaffham
Suffolk	967,680	Ipswich
"	Bury
Essex	980,480	Chelmsford
Kent	983,680	Canterbury
"	Rochester
Sussex	936,320	Chichester	Winchelsea
Surrey	485,120	Southwark
	18,484,920		
Channel Isles . . .		Channel Isles

PROVINCE OF YORK.

Counties.	Acres.	Crown Appointments.	Clerical Appointments.
Northumberland . .	1,197,440	Rothbury
"	Hexham
Cumberland	945,920	Carlisle	S. Bees'
Durham	679,040	Durham	Darlington
Westmoreland . . .	488,320	Appleby
Yorkshire	3,815,040	York	Whitby
"	Ripon	Bridlington
"	Beverley	Wakefield
Lancashire	1,171,840	Liverpool	Lancaster
"	Manchester
Cheshire	673,280	Chester
Shropshire	858,240	Shrewsbury
"	Ludlow
Staffordshire	734,720	Lichfield	Stafford
"	Wolverhampton
Herefordshire	550,400	Hereford
Worcestershire . . .	500,000	Worcester
Derbyshire	656,640	Chesterfield
Nottinghamshire . .	535,680	Southwell
Carried forward	12,806,560		

PROVINCE OF YORK—continued.

Counties.	Acres.	Crown Appointments.	Clerical Appointments.
brought forward	12,806,560		
stershire . . .	514,560	Leicester
ndshire . . .	9,102
ickshire . . .	577,280	Coventry
amptonshire . .	650,880	Peterborough	Northampton
lnshire . . .	1,758,720	Lincoln	Boston
"	Grantham
sey . . .	173,000
urvonshire . . .	390,520	Bangor
ighshire . . .	387,600	Wrexham
shire . . .	172,790	S. Asaph
methshire . . .	430,000
gomeryshire . .	491,600	Montgomery
	18,362,612		
f Man . . .		Sodor and Man

as already been said that the dioceses above mentioned are to be coextensive with the counties in which they are found; we divide the total number of acres by the total number of dioceses (exclusive of Sodor and Man and the Channel Isles) it will be found that the average will be a trifle under 500,000 acres each. This would make them of a manageable size, a result which has not hitherto been attained.

(To be continued.)

DÖLLINGER'S FIRST AGES OF CHRISTIANITY.

First Ages of Christianity and the Church. By JOHN IGNATIUS DÖLLINGER, D.D. Translated by HENRY NUTCOMBE, M.A. 2 Vols. London: Allen and Co. 1866.

It was a time, not so very long ago, when a Church history from a Roman Catholic would be received with very considerable suspicion, and hardly read at all by English Churchmen. Accepted without hesitation, it was considered necessary that it should be written by a Protestant. Men were not very particular as to the writer if he were a heretic or not, so long as he were a Unitarian. This time is now passed; the English theological community knows well that a history of the ancient Church is more valuable if fairly written, and to present a more faithful picture, than if it comes from the pen of a learned Roman Catholic, than

from a mere Protestant. Nor is the reason far to seek; to write a history of the Church a man must be imbued with the spirit and idea of the Church. It is equally difficult to write the history of a sect, except for a member of that sect; ideas are formed in a different mould, and unless so formed, the central idea can hardly be realized. To take an instance near home; it would be difficult, if not impossible, for an English Churchman, one thoroughly imbued with Church principles, to write a philosophical history of the Free Kirk in Scotland. He would fail to grasp the principle that caused the disruption; he would be unable to comprehend the importance of the point in dispute; it is so totally different from anything he has been accustomed to, and does not, in the apprehension of a Churchman, in any way touch the vital principle of religion. So when the true idea of the Catholic Church has been lost, as it is among Protestants, a writer of that school fails to set before his readers a true idea of the state of things he professes to describe, for he has not, in his own mind, a real understanding of the thing he writes about. What he really has in his mind is a system of Christianity, not a living Body; for to him the Church is a theological system, not a distinct body animated with a divine spirit. Dr. Döllinger, writing as a theologian and a Churchman, understands both; he presents before us both Christianity as a system, and the Church as a divine kingdom. In our Lord's Person too, he sees rather the divine energy of the Head of the Church, the type of what the Church should be in her members, than the mere teacher.

"So infinitely was CHRIST exalted above all human teachers, that in Him, word and deed, the idea and its realization, were always one. What He taught referred principally to Himself, His mission, His work; the mere fact of His appearance among men was the most eloquent sermon; His very presence, His acts, His sufferings, and His death, were the living energizing commentary on His teaching, and its most superabundant confirmation. He put forth no detailed doctrine about GOD, His being, His attributes, and tokens; but He offered Himself directly as the Image of the FATHER, so that whoever knew Him knew the FATHER. He spoke little about GOD being merciful towards men, and loving them as a father loves his children; but He presented Himself to them as the living embodiment of mercy, in whose person GOD had humbled Himself to man's estate. When He said, 'All power is given Me in heaven and upon earth,' it was but a description of His own acts, for when He worked, the blind saw, the lame walked, and the dead were raised. In that fulness of power which He exercised on earth as the Mighty Ruler of nature and of natural forces, men were able, and were bound to recognize that the Supreme LORD and Lawgiver of all had appeared in His Person. He not only, like John, exhorted men to repentance, He not only spoke of the righteousness of GOD, and His displeasure against sin; but He took also on Himself the greatest of all penances, He showed through His sufferings

and His voluntary death what an offering the holiness of GOD and the sinfulness of man required. What gave to His teaching about the powerlessness of death, the indestructibility of life, and the future resurrection of man, its convincing power, was the fact of His re-appearance among men Himself for forty days as the Conqueror of death, and the First-fruits of the resurrection."—Pp. 18, 19.

By following a like train of thought miracles came in, not as interruptions of the order of things, but as the natural consequence of the Incarnation, not merely as evidences that CHRIST was a teacher sent from GOD, but as the inherent power of the indwelling Godhead naturally manifesting itself.

"Thus, then, His works, like His words, had a stamp peculiarly their own. To work miracles was His natural, His normal state; He showed Himself in His miracles as the LORD and Ruler of nature. He commanded the winds, and they were still; He walked upon the waves; He attested His power over nature, and His human kindness, by turning water into wine; He fed thousands with a few loaves and fishes; He freed those possessed with devils; He healed multitudes of the sick He fanned into a new flame the sparks of life when already quenched, and raised the daughter of Jairus, the youth of Nain, His friend Lazarus A healing virtue streamed from the very touch of His garment, as indeed what took place in His own case, His transfiguration, and at last, His resurrection and ascension, showed that His very bodily nature was permeated and ruled by the Divine."—Pp. 19, 20.

How very different the idea of our LORD given by those who regard only His teaching, and His Church as a mere theological system!

If we now go a step onward, and look at the Church as the Body of CHRIST, in which the Spirit of CHRIST is working in the world, as His visible representative, we shall find the same truth. The Apostles were the witnesses of CHRIST, they represented Him, they carried out His work in His way. They were not sent to teach Christianity, but CHRIST; not to set up a theological system, but to be the means of bringing men into spiritual communion with the divine Person of CHRIST, and be partakers of the Divine nature. The writing of books was, so to speak, a not absolutely necessary part of their commission.

"It was inconsistent with the origin and dignity of the Founder of the Christian Religion to write Himself. He was too exalted to become a writer. It was not by a book, but by His acts, His words, the means of grace He ordained, and the Spirit whom He bestowed, that He chose to found His Church. Nor did He give His disciples a commission to write. They were to go from place to place bearing witness everywhere personally by word of mouth, and claiming to be heard, and so to carry His message and form communities. When He promised them the

assistance of the HOLY GHOST, He was not thinking of authorship, but of the cases when they would have to speak; and even in that solemn moment of departure, when He gave His last charges including all their Apostolic duties, there is no mention made of writing books. So again was it when Paul was called to the Apostolate; and among the *charismata* he reckons a prophetic gift, but no special gift of writing.

"Several Apostles, James, son of Zebedee, Philip, Thomas, Simon, and Matthias, have left no writings. A quarter of a century passed from the Ascension before anything was written at all; and those who then began to write were led to do so from immediate circumstances and had no idea of leaving behind them religious documents, or full confessions of faith—books like those of Moses and the Prophets, or the original records of other religions, which claim to be divinely inspired codes of doctrine and practice. None of the Apostles held it necessary to collect and put on record in one or more written documents a summary of his oral teaching, nor have any done so; still less could there be any design of the writings of separate Apostles being made to supplement each other, and combined into a general statement of Christian doctrine. That could not be attempted, because there was no such thing with the Apostles as a previous arrangement and distribution of labour in their writings—every one wrote as the particular occasion required to supply the want of personal intercourse, to confirm what had been taught already by word of mouth, to answer questions, resolve doubts, denounce errors and evil customs, in short, to do the very thing which was best and oftenest done by word of mouth. Paul attached greater weight to his oral teaching, to sight and speech, than to his writings. While he addressed the Roman Christians in his most elaborate and dogmatic Epistle, he yet desired to see them, that from the fulness of his spirit he might impart some gift of grace to confirm their faith. He wrote to the Thessalonians, that he prayed without ceasing to see them again to supply the defects of their faith. In all the Apostolic Epistles a previous knowledge of the matter of faith is implied. 'I have not written unto you as though ye knew not the truth,' says John."—Pp. 201, 202.

Under these considerations, then, we cannot in any way look at the Apostles as mere teachers of Christianity, nor of the New Testament as a complete code of doctrine. On the contrary, no part of it is drawn up in that form. There is no trace of a Creed, properly so called; there are no express directions as to the form and manner of worship.

"All this, in general and in detail, is widely different from a code of doctrine, or summary of faith. The very fundamental doctrine of Christianity, so strange and so offensive to Jews of that day, so now to Gentiles—that of the Holy Trinity—the doctrine the Church was to be engaged for centuries in fixing and building up, is nowhere affirmed in detail, scarcely touched on in passing, only always assumed. Yet without this dogma, the whole fabric of Christianity which rested on it was insecure; every believer had to realize it as a fact, and to recognize

and find the working out of his own salvation in the manifestation of the FATHER through His Incarnate SON, and the action of the SON through the HOLY GHOST, though Christians of that day were far from seeking to master the mystery in the form of any abstract theory or speculation."—Pp. 205, 206.

When we further remember that, for the first twenty years after the founding of the Church, there was no part of the New Testament written, and that the last book was not composed till some sixty or seventy years after; and still more, that these books or Epistles were not gathered into one volume, but remained, at least many of them, in the possession of the communities to which they were addressed, we shall realize the fact that it was upon the oral teaching of living men, that the early Christians derived their faith and knowledge.

While saying this, however, we must not forget that the Church did receive a collection of writings as of divine authority, viz., the books of the Old Testament. These, at least some of them, are quoted and referred to by the writers of the New Testament; but even at that time the Canon of the Old Testament was not settled. There were some doubtful books which are now received into the Canon, and there were others incorporated in the Canon of one important Jewish community—the Alexandrian—which were not recognized by the Palestinian.

"The Early Church received from the synagogue the collection of Jewish sacred books in their then threefold division, law, prophets, and hagiographa (Ketubim,) which name, however, came later into use. This collection of sacred writings were by no means closed at the time of CHRIST; there were different views about some parts of the hagiographa; even long after the destruction of Jerusalem, there was much dispute among the Jews about the value of the so-called three books of Solomon, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Canticles, and about receiving the book of Esther into the Canon. The school of Shammai wished to exclude Ecclesiastes from the Canon, and the new synagogue founded at Jamnia after the Jewish war had an examination of witnesses about the extent of the third part of the Hebrew Canon. The Alexandrian and Hellenistic Jews had in their collection of sacred writings the books written or preserved only in Greek, whose origin dates from the four centuries between Malachi and John the Baptist; and these, as being incorporated in the Alexandrian version, passed with the rest into the use of the Christian Church. These books—Sirach (i.e., Ecclesiasticus,) Wisdom, Tobias, Judith, Maccabees, and Baruch—filled up the gaps, in a doctrinal and an historical sense, left between the captivity and Roman dominion in the Hebrew collection; they were partly the result of the marriage of the Jewish and Greek mind, and the contact of Mosaicism with Greek philosophy, and thus acted as connecting links to prepare and pioneer the way for Christianity, and, if not quoted by name in the Apostolic writings, they are often used word for word."—Pp. 209, 210.

Besides these books, the writers of the New Testament quoted other Jewish books, some of which are still extant; S. James, iv. 5, quotes from some lost book, which he calls "Scripture;" S. Jude quotes from the Anabasis of Moses, and the Book of Enoch. Moreover,

"The doctrinal traditions of the Jewish necessarily passed into the Christian Church, CHRIST Himself had recognised them, taught one of them, and referred His disciples to the authority of those who sat in Moses' seat, who were their organs; and if He sharply denounced their arbitrary interpretations of the law, and reproached them with making God's law of none effect by their own inventions, put forth as traditions of the Fathers,—as in forbidding works of charity on the Sabbath, or allowing a son to let his parents starve, that he might put the money he had saved into the temple treasury,—those were perversions of individuals, or at most of whole schools; the dominant teaching was independent of them, and was rather confirmed or implied in the addresses of CHRIST and of the Apostles. From tradition came the common teaching about the Resurrection, Judgment, Paradise and Gehenna, without any distinct evidence out of the Hebrew canon. A good deal in the New Testament about angels and fallen spirits comes, not from the Bible, but tradition. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews has got from the same source his statements about the contents of the ark, the vessel of manna and Aaron's rod, and about the details of the sacrificial ritual; and S. Paul his notion of a heavenly Jerusalem, and a third heaven, and the names of the Egyptian magicians, Jannes and Jambres. The assertions of SS. Peter and Jude about the sin and punishment of the fallen angels are similarly drawn from Jewish tradition."—Pp. 220, 221.

These extracts will sufficiently show the great importance of this book in setting before us the true picture of the early Church. The work itself is valuable in counteracting the erroneous impressions which most of us have received from reading books of another class; works which, if not written with a certain definite purpose of making the history of the primitive Church and of the New Testament square with modern nineteenth-century notions, yet are written by persons so imbued with these notions, that they saw all history only through their own spectacles, and these highly coloured. The writers whom we have been accustomed to follow have generally desired to prove that the Anglican branch of the Catholic Church took the Primitive Church for her model, and ordered her faith and her practice according to the primitive standard; but, in their efforts to show this, they did not begin by an impartial investigation of what was the faith and practice of the Primitive Church, and then compare with it the Anglican, but they took the Anglican for their model, and tried to make it appear that the Primitive was like it. They seemed to think that it was a principle of loyalty to uphold the Anglican formularies as perfect.

tion, and to allow no flaw in them, and to explain away the points in the Primitive Church that clashed with them. Thus we have not had the true state of the early Church fairly set before us: for even Bingham is not free from this vice. Take, for instance, prayers for the departed: how few of our divines have fairly and honestly maintained that this was a universal practice of the Church! Those writers who have done so are nearly all non-jurors. So also unction for the sick—the careful manner in which we are always told that the latter, together with orders, absolution, &c., ought not to be called sacraments. In a word, there was the presence of a Protestant spirit instead of a Catholic one in these writers, and running through their works. We have absolutely no manual fit to put into the hands of a theological student, written by an Anglican, and adapted to the needs of the present times.

Not the least useful part of Dr. Döllinger's work is the Appendices. The first, which is the longest, is a summary of the opinions of the Fathers as to Antichrist and the Man of Sin. The very general impression that the Second Coming of CHRIST was soon to take place made the Fathers apply the prophecy of S. Paul (2 Thess. ii.) to their own time. Starting from the point, which was considered a settled one, that the Roman Empire was the fourth kingdom of Daniel's vision, they looked for Antichrist to arise out of it. Accordingly Nero was first fixed upon as the "man of sin:" his death did not dissipate the idea; for some believed that he was miraculously preserved, to appear again; others that he would be raised from the dead. Dr. Döllinger says:—

"As to the Fathers, all, or most of them, agree on the following points:—1. The 'Man of Sin' will appear towards the end of the world, at the time of the fall of the Roman Empire, and will set up his own kingdom in its place. 2. He will appear as the Messiah expected by the Jews, and will either himself build their temple, or will get possession of it when it has been rebuilt. 3. 'He that letteth' is the Roman Empire. 4. 'The mystery of iniquity that already worketh' is Nero. . . . Irenæus is the first Father who undertakes to explain 'sitting in the temple of God.' He maintains that the language only suits the true God, and the temple of Jerusalem. He adds that the Apostle's meaning is the same as that of CHRIST, (S. Matth. xxiv. 15,) when speaking of the 'abomination of desolation in the holy place;' and that the Antichrist will establish his kingdom at Jerusalem, and have himself worshipped there in the temple, (v. 25, 2—4.) He must have assumed a previous rebuilding of the temple by the Jews; and this was the usual idea in the following centuries. It was well known that those whom Paul addressed could only understand the temple at Jerusalem, for the direct reference to Daniel's prophecy excluded any other interpretation; and thus it was pretty generally assumed that, when the scattered Jews were gathered together again and restored, the temple would be rebuilt. The Sibylline books implied this throughout; and it was the more believed, as for some time considerable remains of the

temple were standing. In the fourth century it was supposed that Antichrist himself would rebuild it—a view foreign to the older Fathers: indeed Lactantius says he would try to destroy it. The difficulty of a temple built by Antichrist being called by the Apostle a temple of God did not trouble them.”—Vol. ii., pp. 269, 270.

Then S. Irenæus and Hippolytus identified the “man of sin” with the “little horn” of Daniel, and attached to him the two “beasts” of the Apocalypse; and held that Antichrist should destroy the Roman Empire. By his magical arts he would not only reign at Jerusalem, but rule both East and West: proclaiming himself the Messiah, he would claim divine worship; and the three events were expected to succeed each other rapidly—the destruction of the Roman Empire, the revelation of Antichrist, and the end of the world. Antichrist must be a Jew in order to be accepted as the Messiah: it was expected that he should be born of the tribe of Dan, because Dan was the serpent, (Gen. xlix. 17,) and was left out in the sealing of the tribes, (Rev. vii.) Some thought he should be born of a woman, with Satan for his father—an incarnation of the devil; thus the counterpart of CHRIST, the Incarnate Son of God. They all took the prophecy literally, that his reign should be three and a half years—the exact time of our LORD’s ministry: and that the two witnesses are Enoch and Elijah.

Joachim, Abbat of Bari, was the first who invented the modern Protestant system of interpretation; the year-day computation, and the political signification. Daniel’s 1260 days meant 1260 years after CHRIST; the mystical Babylon was the German Empire of the Hohenstaufen; while, of course, Rome was the true Jerusalem oppressed by the German Empire. The Waldenses and the followers of Wycliffe saw the polemical value of this method of interpretation, and turned it against the Pope, whom they now called Antichrist. In the great schism in the sixteenth century this interpretation was confirmed, until it was thought heresy to deny it. One of the accusations against Archbishop Laud was his refusal to recognise the Pope as the “Man of Sin.”

This view is now being everywhere given up, both in Germany and in England; it has melted away by its own inherent weakness. As long as only some few striking points were brought out, and compared with the prophecy, it seemed plausible enough; but no sooner was there an attempt made to enter into particulars, and to draw up an elaborate scheme of fulfilment, than the whole broke down. It is only necessary to read Elliott’s “*Horæ Apocalypticæ*,” and Faber on the “*Prophecies*,” to find out how impossible it is to construct a consistent whole. No two of these interpreters can agree in the details, or with each other; yet they profess to describe *fulfilled* prophecy. It was Dr. Todd of Dublin and the lat

Dr. Maitland who gave the *coup de grace* to this system. Dr. Döllinger, though he quotes English writers, and even Dr. Todd himself, seems to be ignorant of the "Donellan Lectures" of the latter on Daniel and the Apocalypse. Dr. Todd's work, more than any other in the English language, sets before us clearly the opinions of the Fathers on this subject. Before leaving this Appendix, may we be permitted to suggest, that since the greatest difficulty of all interpretation consists in the opinion that the Roman Empire is the last of the four empires of Daniel, out of which Antichrist is to arise, and that the Antichrist has not arisen, though the Roman Empire has for many hundred years ceased to exist, it is possible there may be another way of computing the empires? Thus, if we suppose that the empires mean those which held Judea, may we not take the Babylonian, Persian, Median, &c., to be only one, under different dynasties? Then this would be the first, the Roman the second, the Mohammedan the third, leaving the fourth to Antichrist.

The last Appendix is on the question of divorce. In the Church is divorce *de vinculo* allowable? Do the words of our LORD sanction it? or, to put the matter exactly, does adultery on either side *ipso facto* dissolve the marriage tie? The whole rests on a certain speech of our LORD given by S. Matthew. If it means that it is dissoluble, then, as Dr. Döllinger shows, we are compelled to maintain—1, that the word *πορνεία* may mean adultery; 2, to find ground for its being used in this passage instead of the proper term *μοιχεία*; 3, that adultery on either side dissolves marriage. Now, not only in the New Testament, but in all Church writers, these two words are never confounded: *πορνεία* is never used as a generic term including adultery. Dr. Döllinger cites numerous passages from the LXX., the New Testament, and the Fathers, to prove this, and we think he does so most distinctly. Further—

"To make it intelligible that CHRIST, while declaring marriage a divine and indissoluble bond, should yet have annulled His own rule, and allowed divorce and re-marriage in all cases of adultery, the principle has been set up, that one or more acts of adultery destroy the essence of marriage, and the formal dissolution is only the recognition and natural consequence of an accomplished fact. . . . But till now there was a scruple in carrying out the theory consistently. When that is done, a view of marriage and matrimonial questions very different from the teaching and practice of the Christian Church follows.

"According to the teaching of CHRIST and the Apostle Paul there are three factors of marriage—GOD, the husband, and the wife; to separate from a husband is to separate from GOD; a divine bond implies a divine right, and this can the less be annulled by the act of one party, since even the desire to annul it cannot always be assumed. No human act can annul a divine right, nor human sin dissolve a divine bond. From the moment when CHRIST declared that GOD sanctifies

and seals the marriage bond, and what He has bound man may not sever, it is a law for the Church that marriage *cannot* be dissolved; and so the LORD understood it when He denounced on the three persons concerned in such a transaction the curse of adultery; and S. Paul, when he made the marriage bond a type of the indissoluble union of CHRIST and the Church, and therefore itself indissoluble. It is a contradiction to make a generally transient error able to dissolve a bond embracing the whole life and all its relations,—a sin against the lower and physical side of marriage destroy what is a spiritual fellowship and institution for the common bringing up of Christian children. Such a sin makes no chief end of marriage impossible. . . . The really Christian view of the question requires that the wound inflicted by adultery on a divine bond should not be incurable; but, if a temporary separation follow, that the door should always be left open for repentance on one side, and true forgiveness on the other. CHRIST showed that forgiveness should not be denied to the fallen wife by His way of treating the adulteress brought before Him, and inculcated it by saying that we should forgive our brother, not seven times, but seventy times seven.”—Pp. 314, 315.

What, then, did our LORD mean by fornication? He meant incontinency before marriage. If the woman had had connection with another man previous to marriage, and she came to her husband's bed not a maid, then it was no marriage: he might put her away, and send her back to her father's house. Nothing but this can break the nuptial bond.

We turned with some curiosity to see how Dr. Döllinger treated two passages in the New Testament especially relating to S. Peter—S. Matth. xvi. 18, and Gal. ii. Of the first it is maintained that the Church is built on S. Peter, who is the “Rock.” S. Peter, of his own impulse, made confession of CHRIST's Godhead; for this, says Dr. Döllinger, he was repaid by four closely allied promises of future power and pre-eminence in the Church. 1st, He should be the Rock whereon CHRIST should build His Church; 2nd, the Church built on him should never fail; 3rd, he should have the keys of the kingdom of heaven; 4th, he should have the power of binding and loosing in heaven and earth. To this is appended the following note:—

“The Greek translator of the Aramaic text was obliged to use Πέτρος and πέτρα: in the original, Cephais stood in each place without change of genders—‘Thou art stone, and on this stone,’ &c., Cephais being both name and title.”—P. 41.

Whether any one has a right to assert what were the exact words used by our LORD in the Aramaic is a very doubtful question: any rate, we have only to deal with the Greek text; and, supposing the word “Cephais” was used in both cases—of which there is no proof—there remains still the fact to be accounted for, that the Greek Gospel gives two. Why did not the Greek translator

and again another supposition, that it is a translation—use *πέρπος* in both? The fact that *πέρπα* is used in the Gospel, and not *πέρπος*, at least proves what was the primitive tradition on this point. We have seen it very confidently asserted in print that at the institution of the Holy Eucharist our LORD spoke in Aramaic, and that in that language there is only one word for “is” and “represents;” so that “This is My Body” means “This represents My Body.” Even were this true, which it is not, we have to deal with the Greek text, not with any supposed Aramaic.

On Gal. ii. there is a very clever defence of S. Peter; but it does not remove from our mind the conviction that S. Paul did reprove S. Peter, and that the former was right and the latter wrong.

THE REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE OF CONVOCATION ON RITUAL.

1. *Report of the Committee of the Lower House.*
2. *Lights before the Sacrament.* By JOHN DAVID CHAMBERS, M.A., Recorder of Sarum. London: Stevens and Son, and Masters.
3. *Audi Alteram Partem.* By Rev. H. J. PYE, M.A., Prebendary of Lichfield. Birmingham: Sackett.
4. *Mutual Conciliation advocated.* A Sermon by the Rev. Dr. OLDEKNOW.
5. *Anti-Ritual Proceedings.* By the same.
6. *Bible Ritualism Indispensable.* By the Rev. R. W. ENRAGHT, B.A., Curate of S. Luke the Evangelist, Sheffield. London: Masters.
7. *We have an Altar.* By the Rev. G. R. PRYNNE, M.A. London: Masters.
8. *Early Christian Ritual.* By Dr. LITLEDALE. London: Cull.
9. *The Church Monitor.* London: Palmer.
10. *The Church Advocate.* Bristol: Morris.

THE publication of the document which is named first above must certainly be considered to form an important stage in the history of the Ritual Controversy among us. There is nothing at all in it that is necessarily final or conclusive, but the moral weight of it, as was foreseen by Mr. Mackonochie, cannot be other than very great. It was an ingenious and unlooked for move on the part of the Upper House of Convocation, (for which we believe we are indebted to the Bishop of Oxford,) to lay upon the Lower House the burthen of examining the question at issue and reporting on it. The Lower House

it will be remembered invited action, or at least a judgment on the part of the Upper House. Of course there were difficulties in the way of the Bishops seeming to prejudge matters which would eventually have to come before them, not in a speculative, but in a judicial form. But further than this their Lordships doubtless felt that the Lower House, being more miscellaneous in its composition, was really better adapted for prosecuting an inquiry of this nature, which needs to be looked at from many sides, than they could possibly be. It was a bold experiment, though undoubtedly a step towards removing from the Bishops what has been so often charged as a reproach upon them, that they act in an autocratic manner, and in no way realise the admirable theory of the spiritual head of each separate diocese sitting in the midst of his chapter, (who in their turn are theoretically appointed on account of their superior knowledge and wisdom,) and taking counsel with them concerning those more weighty affairs which are becoming ripe for judgment.

The result may certainly be said to have justified the sagacity of the proposer. The Report does very great credit to its authors, dealing with the questions submitted to them in the way most calculated to produce a beneficial effect. The Lower House of Convocation of course cannot conclude anything, but they can advise, and still more, being a representative body, they would naturally approach the subject from various points of view,—and so we regard what they have written as being the voice of the best and wisest of the English priesthood.

The Committee discuss the question of Ritual on the mixed ground of law and of the spirit and genius of the English Church. The law they wisely abstain from laying down too dogmatically, and with good deal of what may be called the mind of the Church of England. In making this remark however, we would guard ourselves against seeming to sanction a plea which is now very generally put forward by the Protestant party, viz., that desuetude can overrule law. We will not deny that disuse may be pleaded to some extent in excuse for the principle of *laissez-faire*. But if the thing lost is both right in point of law and good, then surely all honour is due to those who revive the matter in question, and so remove the scandal resulting from our practice being at variance with the Church's requirements.

In the introduction to the Report our readers will not fail to note two good features, viz., one a reference to past disputes of like nature, suggestive of the reflection that men are naturally disposed to magnify too much the difficulties of current events, and to forget what a healer of differences Time is; and secondly, attributing a large proportion of present doubts and anxieties to the absence of opportunities for bishops taking counsel with their dioceses.

And now coming to the substance of the Report, we congratulate

the Committee on the selection of subjects which they made for themselves. There is a time to be silent, says the wise man, as well as a time to speak. On such subjects as the mixed chalice and the use of coloured stoles there was no need for them to speak, but specially are we glad that they have practised a discreet reticence on the question of the priest's right position at the altar. The subject is of extremest moment, for it is not too much to say that the true sacrificial character of the Eucharist can never be taught by a priest placing himself at the end of the altar and having his curate as his *vis-à-vis*. But this is well known to be one of those subjects on which the individual from whom the committee has undoubtedly sought its inspiration, has not been able as yet to realize the catholic view or the vast importance which attaches to it. We are most thankful therefore, we repeat, for the committee's forbearance on this point; for it is one which must be carried out in practice—being to the Eucharistic service what the intoning of the prayers is to the daily Office—its very essence. We should wish first to see it practised more universally, and then it must be allowed, as nothing but inveterate prejudice can hinder a person from seeing that it is what the Rubric intended to order.

And now, turning to the positive side of the Report, it is a good sign that the committee proceed at once to grapple with the two most important elements of ritualism—the Eucharistic vestments and the altar lights. There was a time when a little doubt seemed to have been cast on both of these great liturgical adjuncts—first by the reference to Queen Elizabeth's Advertisements as intended to modify the introductory rubric of the Prayer Book; and secondly, by questioning the legality of Edward's Injunctions. Both these difficulties seem now to be entirely removed: but if catholics would have desired a more explicit pronouncing on these points from the Committee of Convocation, they should remember that till quite lately the legal difficulties had not been quite removed. It is really impossible to attribute any weight to the "opinion" of the Attorney General and the presbyterian Sir Hugh Cairns.

On the other points touched on in the Report we have already on several occasions expressed our sentiments, and will therefore only say that we think the committee could not have concluded otherwise than they have done. What is said about elevation by no means excludes what, in common with Archdeacon Freeman, we have ourselves always advocated—the raising of the elements in the act of consecration so that they may be seen by the people. Nor does the Report condemn the presence of devout persons who do not intend to communicate, nor even of children who are under proper control, during the celebration. All that it seems to condemn is the practice, (necessary to the Roman Church which has no other public service, at least in the morning, but the mass,) of persons of all kinds being present as matter of course, and scarcely

considering Communion at the great forenoon service as a question to be entertained by them at all.

In conclusion, we must put on record the closing paragraphs of the Report, which we trust will receive at the hands of the bishops and of the country the consideration that it deserves. It has in it doubtless something of the nature of a compromise, but we would suggest to Low Churchmen of all shades of opinion, that if they look for any concession to their prejudices on the part of the Ritualistic school, as the result of this Report, they must be prepared to teach the doctrine of the Church and to carry out her principles more faithfully than they have yet done.

"The committee decline to enter into the consideration of any other ritual practices and questions. Several have been brought under their notice, and the committee have discussed them carefully; but they have determined not to deal with them in their report—partly because they do not consider them to be among the number of those things which are causing serious anxiety; and partly because they are persuaded that in many things ritual practice can neither be directed nor restrained to any good purpose by external interference, but must rather be committed to the good sense of the officiating minister, endeavouring to perform his holy functions for the edification of the people in the spirit of the Book of Common Prayer.

"The committee would, however, very strongly represent that the English Church has, by the general structure of her services, and particularly by the article on Ceremonies prefixed to the Book of Common Prayer, declared herself opposed to a minute and burdensome ceremonial, and that she has indicated by her rubrical directions equal opposition to services rendered indecent and unintelligible by a rapid and inaudible mode of utterance.

"Again, the committee would direct their remonstrance against the adoption of a phraseology borrowed from foreign communions, and which is, in some instances, as applied to the ministrations of the Church of England, novel and offensive.

"With regard to a resort to judicial proceedings, the committee earnestly trust that such a course may not be found necessary. If resorted to, it would, in the opinion of the committee, tend to promote, rather than to allay, dissension. They are further of opinion that, to attempt to establish a rule applicable to all places and congregations alike, their diverse characters and circumstances notwithstanding (which would be the necessary tendency of judicial proceeding,) is to attempt to establish a uniformity which cannot be obtained except at the price of peace.

"At the same time the committee would remark, that both excesses and defects in ritual observance are symptoms of a deep-seated evil—namely, the want of a more effective working of the diocesan system; such as would afford better and more frequent opportunities for consultation between the bishop and the clergy and people of his diocese.

"In bringing their report to a conclusion, the committee would represent that the subject of ritualism cannot be sufficiently considered

without a reference to the position of the Church of England in relation, on the one hand, to the Greek and Latin branches of the Church Catholic, and to other foreign bodies of Christians who have retained many features of ancient ritual; and, on the other hand, to the Nonconformist bodies of our own country. They desire, therefore, to observe that, great as is the value of those ancient ritual usages, which the Church of England has inherited from undivided Christendom, and the retention of which may hereafter be found to conduce materially to the restoration of unity, it must, nevertheless, be carefully borne in mind that the national Church of England has a holy work to perform towards the Nonconformists of this country; and that every instance, not only of exceeding the law, but of a want of prudence and tenderness in respect of usages within the law, can hardly fail to create fresh difficulties in the way of winning back to our Church those who have become estranged from her communion.

"The committee deem it right further to declare that, in their opinion, the adoption of the usages discussed by them has, as a general rule, had its origin in no other motive than a desire to do honour to the most holy and undivided Trinity, and to render the services of the English Church more becoming in themselves, and more attractive to the people. None are more earnest and unwearied in delivering the truth of CHRIST'S Gospel, none more self-denying in ministering to the wants and distresses of the poor, than very many of those who have put in use these observances. In the larger number of the practices which have been brought under the notice of the committee—they do not say in all of them—they can trace no proper connection with the distinctive teaching of the Church of Rome. They are, further, of opinion that some advance in ritual is the natural sequel to the restoration and adornment of churches which has so remarkably prevailed during the last twenty-five years, and which is itself closely connected with the revival and growth of religious life during the present century; and although, by the terms of their appointment, the inquiries of the committee have been confined to the subject of excess in matters of ritual, yet they must remark that there are errors of defect widely prevailing amongst us (such as neglect of plain rules of the Prayer Book and curtailment of its Offices) which are no less repugnant to the spirit and order of the Church of England than the addition of unsanctioned ceremonial. Excess of ritualism is, in fact, the natural reaction from unseemly neglect of solemn order.

"The committee respectfully commend their report to the consideration of the house; with earnest prayer to Almighty God that it may assist towards clearing doubts and allaying anxieties.

"H. GOODWIN, Chairman.

"Jerusalem Chamber, June 5, 1866."

PAULINE THEOLOGY.

(Continued from p. 281.)

(11.) THE teaching of S. Paul on the duty of fasting has been already brought forward, and by referring to the Gospels we shall find it in strict accordance with our LORD's teaching and example. He says, that when the Bridegroom, that is Himself, shall be taken from the Church, then shall the disciples fast in those days. (S. Matth. ix. 15.) He also gives directions respecting fasting which imply the performance of this duty, (S. Matth. vi. 16;) and speaks of evil spirits who can only be cast out by prayer and fasting. (S. Matth. xvii. 21.)

Now it is unquestionable, that if our LORD does not here enjoin the duty of fasting, He at least takes it for granted that it will not be neglected by His disciples; yet certain modern writers, as the late Mr. Baden Powell, have asserted that this duty is not "commanded" in Holy Scripture—a statement perhaps verbally true, but having no real bearing, as we shall show, upon our obligation to its due observance. If it were not intended by our LORD that His followers should fast, what reason can be given why He should give any instructions on the right mode of performing it, as e.g. that it is not to be done ostentatiously as the hypocrites. Such directions on any other supposition would obviously be superfluous and unmeaning. They imply the performance of this duty with *His own implicit sanction* at least, by His disciples. And what has been the consequence of neglecting the guidance of the Church, refusing to be in bondage, as people say, to her rules of fasting on certain days? The duty, though undoubtedly resting on Scriptural sanction, since as we know the Apostles and early disciples fasted, and few will deny that their example is binding upon Churchmen in the present day, has been generally neglected; men refuse, as the Church teaches, to fast on certain days, and the consequences which too often have followed their inobservance, has only proved the wisdom of her directions—the duty has been altogether laid aside. But fasting and prayer are often joined together by S. Paul, though not by our LORD, for reasons before stated; the Bridegroom was still with His disciples, and they could not fast till He was taken away from them. Thus S. Paul was ordained with fasting and prayer. (Acts xiii. 2, 3.) He and S. Barnabas ordained elders in every Church with prayer and fasting, (Acts xiv. 23,) and the Apostle mentions fasting and prayer as ordinary Christian duties. (1 Cor. vii. 5.) But let us mark the uniformity of their teaching respecting prayer. Some may have thought that S. Paul uses respecting prayer what may seem exag-

gerated language, or at least expressions which can only be understood with great limitation. Thus he says, "pray without ceasing;" "praying always with all prayer and supplication in the spirit;" "in everything by prayer and supplication, let your requests be made known unto God." But the same teaching in almost the same words, will be found in the Holy Gospels. Our LORD relates the parable of the unjust judge, in order to teach that "men ought always to pray and not to faint." (S. Luke xviii. 1.) If the unjust judge avenged the poor widow, lest by her frequent coming she should weary him; shall not, He says, God avenge His own elect, which cry day and night unto Him; and He also relates the parable of a man who gave three loaves to a friend merely on account of his importunity, and then follow the words: "Ask, (i.e. with such importunity,) and it shall be given you; seek, and ye shall find; knock, and it shall be opened to you. For every one who (in this manner,) asketh receiveth; and he that seeketh findeth; and to him that knocketh it shall be opened." (S. Luke xi.) Thus our LORD lays the same stress upon continual prayer as the Apostle. Men are to "pray always," (S. Paul's words;) the elect cry to God "day and night," and we are sure to prevail with God by mere importunity as it were, as the unjust judge was wearied out to grant the poor widow's suit.

(12.) The subject of celibacy shall now be considered. We must not expect to find in the Gospels, when CHRIST's kingdom was still in its inchoate or rudimental state, the clear and definite teaching of the Apostle suited to the wants of Christian communities, when the Gospel precepts were being realized in the daily life and experience of Christian believers: still the teaching of our SAVIOUR and of the Apostle is essentially one. That celibacy is a higher state is implied, when we are told in the Gospels that some men have made themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, i.e., that they may attain its especial or pre-eminent rewards, (S. Matth. xix. ;) and we believe, that when our LORD promises rewards both here and hereafter to them who, for His sake and the Gospel, have given up house, or parents, or brethren, or wife, or children, that He not only means according to the literal view of the passage, that a hundredfold reward in the life to come shall be given to those who forsake all earthly relations and possessions for His sake; but by mentioning a "wife" our LORD would appear to mean, a giving up the married state that we may more faithfully and zealously devote ourselves to His service—a better interpretation of His words, we think, than that which is commonly given—that a wife is to be divorced or forsaken at the call of CHRIST.

(13.) Our SAVIOUR's teaching on faith shall now be compared with that of S. Paul. Every reader of the Gospels must have noticed how frequently faith in His power and willingness to save,

is required, ere our LORD worked a miracle. Such expressions as the following frequently occur: "According to your faith be it done unto you." "All things are possible to him that believeth." "He, seeing their faith, said unto the sick of the palsy, &c." "O woman, great is thy faith, be it unto thee even as thou wilt." "Believe ye that I am able to do this? according to your faith be it done unto you." Thus also we find S. Paul before healing the lame man at Lystra, "steadfastly beholding him and seeing that he had faith to be healed."

Faith viewed under this aspect may be described as an implicit reliance upon our SAVIOUR's power and willingness to save—if this qualification was wanting His divine power as it were was restrained and limited. "He could," in one place it is said, "do no mighty works on account of their unbelief." But the faith generally spoken of in the Gospels, and especially by S. John, includes other and higher qualifications than these. A few passages shall be quoted. "To as many as received Him gave He power to become the sons of God, even to them who believe on His name." (S. John i. 12.) "God so loved the world, that He gave His only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. He that believeth on Him is not condemned, but he that believeth not is condemned already, because he hath not believed on the name of the only-begotten Son of God." (S. John iii. 17, 18, 36. "Ye will not come to Me that ye might have life." (S. John v. 40.) "This is the work of God, that ye believe on Him whom He has sent." (S. John vi. 29.) "He that cometh to Me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on Me shall never thirst." (S. John vi. 35.) "He that believeth on Me, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water." (S. John vii. 38.) Many other passages might be given, especially from the Gospel of S. John, as e.g., xi. 25, 26; xiv. 1; xvii. 20; but it is unnecessary to add further quotations now; these passages, and similar ones so frequently found in Scripture, show that faith is to be understood in a sense totally different from its ordinary meaning; and that it is not a mere intellectual assent to any truth or proposition, which is obvious from the fact that eternal life is promised to the believer—he has it now, as it were, in actual possession: "he that believeth on Me hath everlasting life;" and also from expressions here used, which are evidently synonymous, "believing in CHRIST," "coming to Him," "and receiving Him;" or "having the SON," as S. John says, which may have been a phrase used by our LORD.

Now two facts must be borne in mind: first, that our LORD gave a new meaning to the word πιστις, or used it in a peculiar sense—a sense which the word in its proper meaning only inadequately expresses; and that this word was used in the same sense by S. Paul and other sacred writers, (as 1 S. John v. 1, 4, 5, 10, 13;

and 1 S. Peter i. 5—9;) its new and peculiar meaning being derived as we can only suppose from our LORD's teaching. He affixed this new meaning to the word, and hence it became amongst the Apostles and disciples its received sense.

We have already spoken of faith as being, according to the teaching of S. Paul, founded on love, and shall now show that the word as used by our LORD, has the same meaning. Consider the terms "receiving CHRIST," or "coming to Him," or, as S. John says, "having the SON." How can we come to CHRIST, or so receive His teaching into our hearts as to devote ourselves to His service, except by loving Him? The first step in Evangelistic or Pauline faith cannot otherwise be taken. We may in a certain sense believe on Him, as the Pharisees did, who were afraid to confess Him before men; but this faith is merely intellectual, and wholly differs from the faith of which S. Paul speaks—"the belief of the heart unto righteousness." How important, according to our SAVIOUR's teaching, is the duty of loving Him; faith is, as it were forgotten, or rather, included in love, love itself being represented as the all-sufficient motive of obedience: "if a man love Me he will keep My words," (S. John xiv. 23;) "if ye keep My commandments ye shall abide in My love;" "he that loveth Me shall be loved of My FATHER, and I will love Him," (S. John xiv. 21;) "that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them," (S. John xvii. 26.)

Again: that the faith which our LORD and His Apostles describe can only spring from love may be proved from other reasons. Neither the apostles nor a Christian at the present day, could believe on JESUS to the salvation of his soul except by loving Him: love can only open our hearts to receive His teaching, however painful or humiliating: love only can remove every prejudice, every wayward affection of flesh and blood which hinders our entire devotion to Him; and it is love which must keep us faithful to Him amidst the temptations of Satan, of an ungodly world, and of our own evil hearts. What other motive can be availing and all-powerful? "Love is strong as death," "many waters cannot quench love, neither can the floods drown it."

But does not our LORD, in His last discourse with His disciples, clearly indicate the origin of true and life-giving faith? He says, "Ye have loved Me, and have believed that I came forth from God:" unless they had loved Him they would not have believed in Him so as to persevere in their devotion to His service; nothing else could have preserved them from the apostasy of some "who walked no more with Him."

(14.) In illustration of the present comparison we shall now speak of our union with CHRIST and His indwelling with us. We cannot read S. Paul's epistles without noticing how frequently he dwells upon the necessity of union with CHRIST, which he expresses

by our being "in Him." Thus he says, "If CHRIST be in you, the body is dead because of sin," (Rom. viii. 10;) he also speaks of believers as "sanctified in CHRIST JESUS," (1 Cor. i. 2;) "if any man be in CHRIST, he is a new creature," (2 Cor. v. 17;) "know ye not that JESUS CHRIST is in you, except ye be reprobates?" (2 Cor. xiii. 5.) Now compare the teaching of our LORD with that of S. Paul: "Every branch in Me that beareth not fruit He taketh away. Abide in Me, and I in you. As the branch cannot bear fruit of itself except it abide in the vine, no more can ye except ye abide in Me. He that abideth in Me, and I in him, the same bringeth forth much fruit. If a man abide not in Me, he is cast forth as a branch and withered. If ye abide in Me and My words in you." (S. John xv.) "The glory which Thou gavest Me have I given them, that they may be one even as We are one; I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; . . . and I have declared unto them Thy Name, and will declare it, that the love wherewith Thou hast loved Me may be in them, and I in them." (S. John xvii.)

But the Apostle not only speaks of CHRIST being in us, but of our thus knowing by an ineffable communion, that "love which passeth knowledge, and our being filled with all the fulness of God," (Ephes. iii. 17—19.) Our Blessed LORD also promises to "manifest" Himself to the faithful people, (S. John xiv. 21,) and to "make His abode with them," (v. 23.) "Behold," He says, "I stand at the door and knock: if any man hear My voice and open the door, I will come in to him, and will sup with him, and He with Me," (Revel. iii. 20.) "Expertus potest dicere, quid sit JESUM deligere."¹

¹ Let us hear the testimony of one of them. S. Bernard says, "Fateor et mihi adventasse Verbum, in insipientia dico, et pluries. Cumque sæpius intraverit ad me, non sensi aliquoties cum intravit. Adesse sensi, affuisse recordor, interdum et præsentire potui introitum ejus, sentire nunquam, sed ne exitum quidem. Nam unde in animam meam venerit, quove abierit denuo eam dimittens; sed et qua vel introierit vel exierit etiam nunc ignorare me fateor. . . . Quæris igitur cum ita sint omnino investigabiles viæ ejus, unde adesse norim? Vivum et efficax est, moxque ut intus venit expergefecit dormitantem animam meam; movit et mollivit et vulneravit cor meum, quoniam durum lapideumque erat et malesanum. Cæpit quoque evellere et destruere, edificare et plantare, rigare arida, tenebrosa illuminare, clausa reserare, frigida inflammare, necnon et mittere prava in directa et aspera in vias planas; ita ut benediceret anima mea Domino, et omnia quæ intra me sunt nomini sancto ejus. . . . Verum quia hæc omnia, ubi abscesserit Verbum, perinde ac si ollæ bullienti subtraxeris ignem, quodam illico languore torpentia ac frigida jacere incipiunt, et hoc mihi signum abscessionis ejus. Tristis sit necesse est anima mea, donec iterum revertatur, et solito recalescat cor meum intra me; idque sit reversionis indicium," (Sermo lxxiv. *de Visitationibus Verbi Sponsi*.) Elsewhere he thus alludes to the "ineffabilis dulcedo" of the manifested presence of the Beloved: "Neque enim suum aliquid non felicitatem, non gloriam, non aliud quicquam, tamquam privato suo ipsius amore desiderat anima quæ ejusmodi est: sed tota pergit in Deum, unicumque ei ac perfectum desiderium est, ut introducat eam Rex in cubiculum suum, et ipsi adhæreat, ipso fruatur. Unde et jugiter revelata facie quod potest cœlesti, sponsi gloriam speculando in eandem imaginem transformatur de claritate in claritatem a Domino Spiritu. Ex hoc plane audire meretur; *Tota pulchra es*

(15.) Again: contrast the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostle on the spiritual worship which God requires as distinguished from mere outward and formal religion. Thus in S. Paul's words, "we are the circumcision which worship God in the spirit, and have no confidence in the flesh," (Philip. iii. 3;) "neither circumcision availeth anything nor uncircumcision, but faith which worketh by love." "The kingdom of heaven is not meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the HOLY GHOST," (Rom. xiv.) Compare these passages with our LORD's teaching, "The kingdom of God is within you." "God is a Spirit, and they that worship Him must worship Him in spirit and in truth." Our LORD thus speaks to the Jews, "the truth shall make you free;" and S. Paul says, "where the Spirit of the LORD is there is liberty." (See also Gal. v. 18.)

Again: our LORD and S. Paul teach the same doctrine of the spiritual knowledge and experience of the faithful Christian, and both use the same peculiar word. Thus S. Paul speaks to the Corinthians: "Now we have received not the spirit of the world, but the spirit which is of God, that we might know the things that are freely given to us of God. . . . But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God, neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." (1 Cor. ii. 12, 14.) "Howbeit then when ye knew not God, ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods; but now after ye have known God, or rather are known of God, how turn ye again," &c., (Gal. iv. 8, 9.) And he prays that the Ephesians may "be able to comprehend with all saints what is the breadth, and length, and depth, and height, and to know the love of CHRIST which passeth knowledge," (iii. 18, 19;) and says, speaking of our Blessed LORD to the Philippians, "that I might know Him and the power of His resurrection and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death," (iii. 10.) Now compare with S. Paul's use of this word (know) a few passages from the gospels. "I am the Good Shepherd," says JESUS CHRIST, "and know My sheep, and am known of Mine; as the FATHER knoweth Me, even so know I the FATHER. . . . My sheep hear My voice, and I know them," (S. John x. 14, 15, 27.) "If ye had known Me, ye should have known My FATHER also," (S. John xiv. 7.) "But all these things will they do unto you for My sake, because they know not Him that sent Me," (S. John xv. 21.) "This is life eternal, that they may know Thee, the only true God, and JESUS CHRIST, Whom Thou hast sent," (S. John xvii. 3.) CHRIST tells us that He will say to the foolish virgins, "I know you not," (S. Matth. xxv. 12;) for in S. Paul's words, "the LORD knoweth them that

amica mea. Audet et ipsa loqui: Dilectus meus mihi et ego illi. Atque hujusmodi felicissima et jucundissima confabulatione delectatur gloriosa cum sponso." (Sermo viii. de diversis affectionibus.)

are His," (2 Tim. ii. 19.) In the passage we have quoted from the Galatians the Apostle says, "After ye have known God, or rather are known of Him;" thus alluding to the twofold aspect under which a sinner's return to God may be viewed: the Galatians "knew" God by listening to the preaching of His Apostle, and becoming in Holy Baptism members of the body of His beloved SON: or we may say, "they were known of Him," when God sent His messenger to reclaim them from their wanderings, and they were drawn to Him by preventing grace. Thus they had found CHRIST, or as we may say, had been found by Him. Now this twofold view of a sinner's repentance is strikingly set before us in our LORD's parables. Thus in the parable of the prodigal, the lost son says, "I will arise, and go to my father;" whilst in the parable of the lost sheep, the good shepherd leaves the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and goes after the lost one, and brings it home on his shoulders rejoicing: the woman also who had lost the piece of silver sweeps the house, and seeks diligently until she finds it.

Again: as respects another passage quoted. S. Paul tells the Philippians that "he knew CHRIST and the fellowship of His sufferings, being made conformable unto His death." Our LORD likewise says, "If any man will come after Me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross daily, and follow Me," (S. Luke ix. 23;) "unless a man forsake all that he hath, he cannot be My disciple;" "ye shall indeed drink of the cup which I drink of, and be baptised with the baptism that I am baptised with." (S. Matth. xx. 23.)

(16.) CHRIST gave to His disciples a new commandment. He says, "A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another as I have loved you. By this shall all men know that ye are My disciples, if ye have love one to another," (S. John xiii. 34, 35.) "This is My commandment, that ye love one another as I have loved you. . . . These things I command you, that ye love one another." (S. John xv. 12, 17.) Now let us turn to S. Paul: we can only quote a few from the many passages of his epistles bearing on the subject, do not some of them refer to this "new commandment" of our LORD? "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfil the law (*νόμον*) of CHRIST," (Gal. vi. 2.) "Walk in love, as CHRIST also hath loved us, and given Himself for us," (Ephes. v. 2.) "And above all these things put on love, which is the bond of perfectness," (Coloss. iii. 14.) "And the LORD make you to increase and abound in love one towards another, and toward all men," (1 Thess. iii. 12.) "As touching brotherly love, ye need not that I write unto you, for ye yourselves are taught of God to love one another," (1 Thess. iv. 9.) "Now the end of the commandment is love." (1 Tim. i. 5.)

(17.) We have compared the teaching of our LORD and of His apostles on CHRIST's indwelling with the faithful, their loving Him and knowing the fellowship of His sufferings; and what is the

fruit of this blessed union with our Redeemer? the apostle tells us "peace and joy in the HOLY GHOST." Thus S. Paul speaks of the "peace of GOD which passeth all understanding." He says that "CHRIST is our peace," (Coloss. i. 20;) prays for the Thessalonians that "the GOD of peace may sanctify them wholly," (1 Thess. v. 23.) "Now the GOD of peace give you peace always by all means," (2 Thess. iii. 16.) Compare these passages with our Blessed SAVIOUR's promise, "Peace I leave with you, My peace I give unto you," (S. John xiv. 27.) "These things have I spoken unto you that in Me ye might have peace," (S. John xvi. 33.)

(18.) We have now to speak of Christian rejoicing or joy in the HOLY GHOST. "Rejoice in the LORD always," says the Apostle, "and again I say, rejoice;" "rejoice evermore;" "as sorrowful, yet always rejoicing;" "we joy in GOD by Whom we have now received the atonement." "These things," says our LORD, "have I spoken to you, that My joy might remain in you, and that your joy might be full," (S. John xv. 11;) "these things I speak in the world that they may have My joy fulfilled in themselves," (S. John xvii. 13;) "I will see you again, and your heart shall rejoice, and your joy no man taketh from you," (S. John xvi. 22.) Our LORD also tells us of the man who having found the treasure hid in a field "for joy" thereof goeth and selleth all that he hath, and buyeth that field. With "selling all that we have" to buy the Gospel treasure compare Phil. iii. 8—9.

(19.) But though our LORD and His Apostle thus frequently intimate the privileges of GOD's faithful people, they equally dwell, and with frequent reiteration upon the all-important duty of keeping GOD's commandments, the only true foundation of Christian privileges. "GOD," says the Apostle, "will render to every man according to his deeds," (Rom. ii. 6;) "be not deceived, GOD is not mocked, for whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap," (Gal. vi. 7;) "circumcision is nothing, and uncircumcision is nothing, but keeping the commandments of GOD," (1 Cor. vii. 19.) The teaching of our LORD is equally clear and emphatic. "If ye love Me keep My commandments. . . . He that hath My commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth Me. . . . If a man love Me he will keep My words. . . . He that loveth Me not keepeth not My sayings," (S. John xv.) "Herein is My FATHER glorified, that ye bear much fruit; so shall ye be My disciples," (S. John xv.) "Ye are My friends if ye do whatsoever I command you," (S. John xv. 14.) "Every tree that bringeth not forth good fruit is hewn down, and cast into the fire;" "not every one that saith unto Me, LORD, LORD, shall enter into the kingdom of heaven, but he that doeth the will of My FATHER Which is in heaven. . . . Then will I profess unto them, I never knew you; depart from Me, ye workers of iniquity." Our LORD then compares him that heareth His sayings and doeth them, to the wise

man that built his house upon a rock : " and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew and beat upon that house, and it fell not, for it was founded upon a rock. And every one that heareth these sayings of Mine and doeth them not, shall be likened to a foolish man, which built his house upon the sand ; and the rain descended, and the floods came, and the winds blew, and beat upon that house, and it fell, and great was the fall thereof." (S. Matth. vii.)

(20.) The doctrine of the eternity of future punishment shall now be considered. This awful doctrine, we believe, is intimated by our LORD's words thrice repeated in the 9th of S. Mark, " where their worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched," (verses 44, 46, 48,) where the present tense points out the perpetuity of an unending duration ; and especially by our LORD's use of the word *αἰώνιος* in the 25th of S. Matthew, (v. 46,) where He speaks of " everlasting punishment" and " everlasting life:" nor do we suppose that any doubt would have been raised of the eternity of future suffering, any more than of the eternity of future happiness, had attention been fixed on the words before us and on the use of *αἰώνιος* throughout the New Testament ; since what authority can there be for saying that *αἰώνιος*, when used in reference to future happiness, always means everlasting, and when applied to future misery always means temporary. Language could have no definite meaning whatever if a mere theory of this kind is to be received, which rests upon no foundation, but certain preconceived opinions, according to which Scripture is to be interpreted contrary to its plain and obvious sense. We shall now quote a few passages showing the use of the word *αἰώνιος* by our LORD and S. Paul in reference to eternal happiness or misery : in all the passages quoted the same word *αἰώνιος* is used. " Into the fire, the everlasting," (S. Matth. xviii. 8 ;) " inherit everlasting life," (S. Matth. xix. 29 ;) " everlasting torment," (S. Matth. xxv. 46 ;) " everlasting judgment," (S. Mark iii. 29 ;) " everlasting habitations," (S. Luke xvi. 9 ;) " everlasting life," (S. John vi. 27.) S. Paul says, " Ye judge yourselves unworthy of everlasting life," (Acts xiii. 46 ;) " the end everlasting life," (Rom. vi. 22 ;) " an everlasting weight of glory," (2 Cor. iv. 17 ;) " everlasting salvation," (Heb. v. 9 ;) " everlasting judgment," (Heb. vi. 2 ;) " everlasting redemption or deliverance," (Heb. ix. 12 ;) " everlasting destruction," (2 Thess. i. 9.)

Again : let us notice a few cases in which the meaning of *αἰώνιος* in reference to the future life is incidentally implied as it were by the Apostle. Thus he says, (2 Cor. iv. 18,) that " the things which are seen are temporal," (*πρόκαιρα*, for a time,) and that " the things not seen (belonging to the future life) are eternal, (*αἰώνια*)." Now if " eternal" means only enduring for a time, the contrast evidently implied and intended by the apostle would be lost ; he

would then say, "the things which are seen are for a time, and the things which are not seen are also for a time!"

The Apostle, in the sixth chapter of the Hebrews (ver. 2, 3,) speaks of "the resurrection of the dead and of an eternal judgment," amongst "the principles of the doctrine of CHRIST." Now the meaning of an "eternal judgment," which follows as we see the "resurrection of the dead," as commentators generally allow, and the Apostle's words manifestly imply, is that award or recompense which at the day of Judgment will equally be assigned to the righteous and the wicked. This recompense S. Paul terms *αἰώνιος*—the very word, as we have just proved, used by our SAVIOUR in reference to the future happiness of the righteous and the misery of the lost. Now, whatever meaning we may affix to this word, it is at least certain that in the passage before us, it must equally apply to the righteous and the wicked. If eternal or everlasting implies only a finite period, then the happiness of the righteous and the misery of the lost are alike of finite duration, but if the word *αἰώνιος* means never ending, then the happiness of the righteous and the torments of the wicked, are and only can be, infinite and eternal. Now how strange is the inconsistency of writers who have denied the truth of this awful doctrine before us, all of them profess to believe according to Scripture teaching that the rewards of the righteous will be really eternal; let them bear in mind the necessary and unavoidable inference from this passage that the punishment of the wicked will also be eternal.

Another illustration of S. Paul's teaching shall be added from the same Epistle. The Apostle says, that "it is a fearful thing to fall into the hands of the living (i.e., of the everliving¹) God," (x. 31.) Now, why is God called everliving or eternal when allusion is made to the punishment of the wicked? No other reason can possibly be given why the Apostle should here tell us of an eternal God, but that he would most distinctly intimate that the wicked will be eternally punished—an eternal God and therefore an eternal punishment.

Our comparison has shown the harmony of the teaching of our LORD and of His Apostle on Christian doctrine generally; other points of resemblance might have been quoted,² but sufficient illustration has perhaps been given. A few remarks shall now be of-

¹ The epithet *ζών*, so often applied to God in the New Testament, being a contracted form for living for ever (*ζών εις αἰῶνα*;) the full expression will be found in Rev. i. 18; iv. 9; v. 14, &c.

² As e.g., we might compare in illustration of similar narratives in the writings of the fathers, S. Luke's account (Acts xix. 12,) of handkerchiefs and aprons being brought from S. Paul's body to heal diseases and to drive out evil spirits; and also the accounts given in the Evangelists of a woman diseased with an issue of blood, who touched the hem of our LORD's garment and was healed (S. Luke viii. 43—47,) and of the multitudes pressing upon Him, and virtue went out of Him and healed them (S. Luke vi. 19.)

ferred respecting our title; it is, perhaps, superfluous to say, that by "Pauline theology" we have no wish to sanction any of the peculiar views and theories which are especially characteristic of Modern Rationalism, as e.g., that S. Paul's teaching was merely his own private opinions or belief, and really differed from that of other sacred writers. However, we do mean by the expression to indicate an undoubted fact or reality—that S. Paul's writings are marked by certain peculiarities of form and matter, which distinguish him from other sacred writers, as e.g., from S. James. The latter could not, so to speak, have written the Epistle to the Ephesians or Colossians; nor could S. Paul have written an Epistle like that of S. James, in which occurs no mention of the Atonement. There is a real difference both in style and subject matter between the two writers. Thus we have in S. Paul's Epistles a theology characteristic of the Apostle; he brings forward certain subjects more prominently than other sacred writers and treats them in *his own* way. Admitting this we differ entirely from the Rational theory that there is any *real* difference between the writers of the New Testament, who were equally, we believe, guided and directed by the Blessed Spirit of God, "dividing to every man severally as He would." One thing, however, is clear, which we would particularly bring forward, as it has perhaps not been sufficiently considered even by advocates of an orthodox theory of Inspiration—that God in communicating divine truth has made use of the human instrument or agent to the utmost possible extent; that man has been left fully to display his own individual peculiarities of whatever kind, when not interfering with the great object in view. Writers may have been chosen to communicate certain portions of divine truth because, from early education, association with others or their own mental idiosyncrasy, they would be likely to dwell upon or prominently introduce them. Thus it has been thought that S. Paul being a Pharisee and holding with that sect a doctrine of predestination, was chosen by the HOLY GHOST to reveal the true doctrine on the subject. His mind we may suppose, owing to his Pharisaic education, was full of the subject, and he was sure, as people say, in addressing Christian converts to write upon it, and by divine guidance was preserved from error. Another person would have known or cared little about the subject, and would not have been likely to make allusion to it. Thus rightly understanding the expression, Pauline theology may clearly be seen in the subject matter, phrases, and style of reasoning of the Apostle's Epistles; it is simply impossible, even if they did not bear his name, to confuse them with those of S. John or S. Peter; we at once know and recognize, even on a cursory perusal, S. Paul's characteristics.

We have just spoken of the manifold views, theories, opinions, and conjectures which are especially characteristic of modern Ra-

tionalism; few persons consider how completely it is made up of such materials, mostly without even an attempt to bring forward any definite or satisfactory proof. Consider, e.g., the treatment which the Gospel of S. John has received—the beloved Apostle who has given us what may emphatically be called the life-like representation of his blessed Master's character. The writer admits that the Gospel bears undoubted marks of truth, and that we have in it the picture of a divine reality, though he speaks disparagingly of the other three Gospels, which he supposes flowed from the same source and cannot be fully relied upon; but another modern author asserts that the first three or the synoptic Gospels are generally entitled to credit, presenting as they do, an homogeneous account of our SAVIOUR's life, but that S. John's narrative wholly differing from them is at the best of far less authority; we are also told that "some" persons think that S. John's Gospel bears marks of Montanism, i.e., speaking plainly, was "forged" at the close of the second century; whilst another thinks that S. John confused his own belief or teaching with that of our LORD, and that we cannot implicitly trust his recollection of our LORD's discourses after a lapse of forty years! Now, what book, we indignantly ask, written either in ancient or modern times could be regarded as true or genuine, if these conjectures, baseless and contradictory opinions, views, and theories, were allowed to have the least weight or authority? We shall only say of such writers that they bear a most unhappy resemblance to the false witnesses in the high-priest's palace, of whom we are told that "their witness agreed not together."

A review of our subject will suggest important and practical considerations. Consider the state of the Western Church in the middle ages, and it cannot be denied that the grossest moral corruption generally prevailed; no proof of this statement is needed. Catholics and Protestants have equally admitted its truth. As regards our own country, a modern writer has given ample proof of the immoral lives of the clergy and of the oppressive exactions of the consistorial or diocesan courts which, as he states, rendered a reformation necessary and inevitable sooner or later.¹ The pristine strength and purity of our Church was lost—she was unassailable and invulnerable

"Till from *herself* she fell,
Yes! self-abasement paved the way,
To villain bonds and despot sway;"

to the supremacy of Henry VIII. exercised by Cromwell, his vicar-general. Now from what source did the corruptions of the Church flow? Merely, we reply, from the neglect or little practical influence of certain portions of Pauline theology—his spiritual teaching. We do not mean that the Church ever formally denied

¹ Froude's History of England, vol. i. p. 88, 174—183.

or repudiated any portion of the Apostle's teaching. We know that there were many saintly men in the middle ages, but we have no reason to think that the example of their virtues pervaded or leavened the Church generally; on the contrary, they were only as stars shining in darkness more conspicuous by the surrounding gloom which they could not illuminate. The gross corruption of the age may also be proved by the stern denunciations of such men as S. Bernard, against prevailing immorality.¹ It was thought most erroneously a few years ago that the grossest ignorance and immorality then *universally* prevailed; we are now in danger by indiscriminate eulogy of falling into the opposite extreme. With the exceptions that have been made, we have undoubted evidence that gross ignorance, superstition, and immorality did very generally prevail;² even uneducated Roman Catholics of our own day would, we suppose, ridicule the legends related by Venerable Bede and others about purgatory, commonly held and believed in the middle ages; would protest against the genuineness of many relics, which were without suspicion venerated by the faithful, and also repudiate the grossly carnal views of the Eucharistic presence, which were then almost universally held. It was, let it be remembered, solely against these and similar doctrines and usages of the mediæval Church, as *then actually believed and taught*, that the protests of the Anglican Articles were directed, and unless this be borne in mind, we shall wholly mistake their object and meaning. We may indeed safely assert that Catholicism, no less than Protestantism, has a "vicious extreme," that is, has certain tendencies which, unchecked, will lead to the grossest superstition—to a mere outward formal religion in which the heart has no share. An appeal shall be made to the unexceptional testimony of Dr. Döllinger. He gives the following account of a portion of the Eastern Church:—"The Russian Church," he says, "is a dumb one; there is no singing by the congregation, and no sermon, only occasionally, and especially on Imperial fête days does the Pope or Bishop say a few words to impress on the people the duty and great merit of unconditional obedience towards the Czar, and to point out that they cannot better show their love to God than by a faithful subjection to the Imperial will. Amidst such a want of all instruction and spiritual renovation (for there are neither Prayer Books nor ascetic writings in the hands of the people,) the individual remains completely confined within the circle of his own thoughts, and there are no remedies against the overwhelming mass of superstition, which cannot fail to be engendered by a purely ceremonial religion in the absence of doctrine and of the living word."³ And afterwards: "how care-

¹ *Vide* De Consideratione, lib. i., iii. 10; lib. iii., i. 4, 5; lib. iv., xi.

² Ample proof is given in a recent work of the corrupt state of the Church, chiefly from contemporary documents. See Hardwick's *History of the Christian Church* (Middle Age,) chaps. 15, 16.

³ *The Church and the Churches*, translated by Mc Cabe. P. 136.

fully did this Church (of Russia) cherish the bad heritage it had received from the spiritually impoverished Byzantium, a mechanical ritualism; and how carefully did it exclude itself from every breath of spiritual religion and of deeper feeling. How has it allowed its clergy to sink into a mass of rude and mindless machines; how has it left its people without the spiritual nourishment of the tidings of salvation to languish and perish in the dreary monotony of a barren ceremonial and an empty religious etiquette! Amidst endless crossings, and prostrations, and genuflections, the body is kept so hard at work and so completely occupied in the church that the mind has not a moment for thought."¹

We by no means guarantee the correctness of Dr. Döllinger's remarks on the Russian Church: its condition has probably been described, as is too often the case with controversialists, in untrue or exaggerated language. But whatever be the truth of this writer's charges against the Russian Church, a similar charge is undoubtedly to be made against the mediæval Church; and Dr. Döllinger at least has correctly described the effects of a corrupt and unspiritual catholicity. In the middle ages the preaching of the Divine Word was generally neglected, and the people left to the consequences of a mere formal and ceremonial religion. And we cannot doubt that it was to a want of instruction, and the inculcation of the spiritual truths of religion, that the prevailing superstition and immorality were in a great measure owing, as men were thus deprived of the highest, perhaps the only really availing motives to love God, and to keep His commandments. Thus we must allow that the protests against Catholicity by the Paulicians, Albigenses, and other sects, were in some degree called for by the imperfect and one-sided teaching of the Church herself, which practically at least prevailed. These sects were indeed justly chargeable with many errors of their own, but assuredly the Church herself was not free from blame. The Reformation again was a reaction against the corrupt Catholicity of the sixteenth century.

The defective teaching and errors of Protestantism are also to be traced to its holding only partially and incompletely the Pauline theology. Let it be granted that Protestantism has appreciated the importance of spiritual religion as taught by S. Paul, it is yet equally true that it has also rejected his teaching on the unity of the Body, the Apostolical Succession, and Sacramental Grace; and thus, being destitute of a creed resting upon Divine sanction, it has developed, under the guidance of the private judgment theory, into dangerous innovation or heresy.

A few words shall now be added respecting the two parties of our Church, Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic; and the subject before us will help to explain the imperfection and one-sidedness which in some degree are chargeable upon both of them.

¹ The Church and the Churches, p. 140.

Sixty years ago, as will generally be admitted, our Church was in a most unsatisfactory state:¹ the clergy, too often ignorant of spiritual religion and forgetful of the all-powerful motives of the Gospel, or denying their efficacy, made the sum and substance of religion to consist of a mere heathen morality:² their habits also were often immoral, or at best in little accordance with the sanctity of their profession. A reaction took place: a few earnest-minded men sought to awaken the Church from her lethargy,—they grew into a party called “Evangelical,” the leaders being clergy of our Church, and also dissenting teachers. They showed the gross ignorance of Pauline theology which the orthodox clergy too generally displayed, pointed out their inconsistent or disreputable lives, and being men of sincere piety, they stirred up a negligent and unspiritual Church to a sense of her bounden duties and obligations. But the deficiencies of Evangelicalism, when the first generation of pious and earnest-minded advocates had passed away, very

¹ In a work entitled, “The True Churchman Ascertained,” by Overton, (2nd edit., 1802,) extracts are given from the principal orthodox divines of the period; and, making due allowance for the author’s Calvinism, and the *odium theologicum* sometimes manifested, they prove at least, as will presently be seen, that the statements in the text are not exaggerated. Of the general style of preaching which then prevailed, Archbishop Secker says, “our irregularities and divisions are greatly owing” to this, “that we are *usually* indifferent to *vital inward* religion,” (p. 125;) and the Bishop of Durham “conceives, after the most diligent view of the subject, the infrequency in the pulpit of those subjects which constitute the peculiar doctrine of Christianity to be the especial cause of the present deplorable state of religion amongst us.” “Of late times,” adds Bishop Horne, “there hath been a prejudice in favour of good *moral preaching*, as if the people might do very well, or even better, without the knowledge of the Christian mysteries.” (P. 113.) In proof of the want of “vital inward religion,” of which Secker speaks, one writer is quoted as lamenting that “too much is made of faith and devotion.” Another says that “it is no more possible to speak from experience of CHRIST’s power, faithfulness, and love, than to speak from our own experience of CHRIST’s miraculous cures.” Another says, “that to be awakened to a sense of our sins” is “to make religion the gloomiest thing upon earth;” and “to have our minds drawn up to high and heavenly things,” is “to labour under a happier madness;” and “to pretend to any *actual* guidance, sanctification, or comfort of the HOLY GHOST is enthusiasm,* without the benefit of a hearing.” (P. 124.) But even the moral preaching or teaching in vogue was often of a very exceptionable character. Thus one writer tells us that “swearing, and drunkenness, and other such glaring vices, are the signs of a thoughtless mind rather than of a depraved heart;” another considers it amongst the greatest extravagancies to think unfavourably of the state of many “who every Lord’s day attend the service of the Church,” though he says that “any additional attendance at Church (as, e.g., on week-days) would throw a Puritanical gloom over the most cheerful religion in the world.” (P. 117.) Proof is also given that some of the writers quoted held the most heterodox views on the doctrine of the future punishment of the wicked, as that “the teaching of Holy Scripture on the subject is wholly uncertain, and the discussion of it should be banished from the pulpit;” another maintained that the difference in the condition of some who are saved, and of others who are damned, may be infinitely trifling. The belief of some of the writers alluded to on the doctrine of original sin was, at the best, very loose and imperfect, and the theories proposed on the important subject of “veracity” are in the highest degree subtle and Jesuitical.

² A writer of the day observed that “the faith of a devil and the life of a heathen make up what many call a good Christian.” (Ibid. p. 123.)

* Bishop Butler says that the love of God “will everywhere by the generality of the world” be “called enthusiasm.”—Preface to Sermon.

prominently appeared : the orthodox clergy had from the beginning protested against its erroneous teaching on some points, as its disparagement of the importance of good works or making light of the sin of schism, to which might have been added a denial of the Priesthood of the Church and of sacramental grace. The party indeed habitually disregarded the sin of schism, fraternised with orthodox (!) dissenters, advising their adherents when "the Gospel" was not preached in Church to resort to a neighbouring conventicle. And what has been the result? what only could have been the result of the self-destructive theories of Evangelicalism carried into practice? The party, by the confession of its friends, is fast diminishing; where, they ask in vain, are now to be found such men as Newton, Scott, Cecil, Venn, and Martyn? where are their representatives in our own generation? Many of the most pious and learned of the party of latter years, convinced that its teaching is imperfect and unscriptural, have cast off its errors and joined the Anglo-Catholic party, to which a few words shall now be addressed.

When the movement began, its first object was to restore in our Church the belief of Catholic truth. Evangelicalism had borne its legitimate fruits, and essential portions of the faith were in danger of being perverted and lost. Thus it was said in the preface of the first volume of the "Tracts for the Times," that in consequence of the clergy not preaching the doctrines of the Apostolical succession and of the Holy Catholic Church, sectarianism had increased, and there was no effective bond of union amongst Christians. The first object, therefore, of the Catholic revival was to restore a belief of dogmatic truth and also to warn the Church against the prevailing errors of Evangelicalism. Can we wonder, then, that the spiritual teaching of S. Paul did not form a subject of inquiry, no pains being taken to discover that portion of Evangelical teaching which was Pauline, and that which was only a modern corruption or addition?¹ Churchmen too often viewed the Evangelical system, as a whole, not merely, as might have been expected, with suspicion, but even with positive repugnance and prejudice.

But let us look at the matter fairly and dispassionately. S. Paul in his Epistles very often alludes to faith, not merely as preparatory to Holy Baptism, but as *the* principle of regenerate life: it seems impossible as it were, according to his teaching, to overrate the importance of this divine grace, the vehicle of choicest gifts to the soul, yea in a certain sense even of spiritual life and health. A few illustrations of his teaching shall be given. The companion of S. Paul is spoken of as "full of faith and of the HOLY GHOST"—

¹ It must, however, be remembered that the "Tracts" were prematurely brought to a close, or probably the deficiencies complained of would in some degree have been supplied. Proposals were issued by Mr. Oakely and others for a new translation of the works of S. Bernard,—afterwards, unfortunately, set aside, through his secession to the Church of Rome.

to the heathen "the door of faith is opened," since "how can they believe on Him of whom they have not heard"—it pleased God "by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe;" to some "it is given to believe on Him;" Satan "blinds the minds of them that believe not;" we have "access by faith into the *Gospel* state of grace;" we must "continue in the faith;" we "stand by faith," we "walk by faith," the life we "now live in the flesh is by the faith of the SON of God;" we are to abound in faith, since it is "increased or groweth;" we "wait for the promise of the Spirit through faith," and "for the hope of righteousness by faith;" faith "worketh by love;" we are "saved through faith;" we have "access to CHRIST by faith;" He "dwells in us by faith;" we "have peace and joy in believing;" we are to come "in the unity of the faith to a perfect man;" "through faith we inherit the promises;" "without faith it is impossible to please God;" yea the Church itself, the fulness of Him that filleth all in all, is termed "the household of faith."

Again: consider the teaching of S. Paul on the privileges of the inner life. He tells us, in a passage just quoted, that Christians have "peace and joy in believing," and that the "love of God is shed abroad in their hearts, through the HOLY GHOST, which is given them." He prays that his converts may "know the love of CHRIST, which passeth knowledge, and be filled with all the fulness of God," and that the "peace of God, which passeth all understanding, may keep their minds and hearts through CHRIST JESUS," bidding them with remarkable reiteration to "rejoice in the LORD always." He also assures us that the HOLY GHOST "bears witness with our spirits that we are the children of God, and if children, then heirs, heirs of God, and joint heirs with CHRIST."

Now let us first consider the privileges of the Divine life. The teaching of the Apostle in the passages referred to is clear and explicit, and is besides implied in many other portions of his epistles; the same teaching will also be found in the works of writers of undoubted orthodoxy and of saintly knowledge and experience. An extract from S. Bernard's writings has already been given, to which we have added a passage from the "Soliloquy of the Soul," by 'A Kempis.¹ These saintly writers tell us of the unspeakable joy of the Christian when JESUS manifests His presence to the soul, and her sorrow and desolation when the Beloved with-

¹ "Perdendo didici quod habendo possedi. Indicat Dilecti absentia quid contulit ejus presentia. . . . Venit saliens in montibus hilaris et jucundus in ostiis domus meæ; et statim clausi fores carnis, et introduxi ad me Dilectum. Sedique cum eo et requievi sub ejus umbraculo a turbine et a pluvia. Et gavisus sum viso Dilecto. Quidni gauderem? Ipse gaudium meum et exultatio cordis mei. Eja quid habui et quid in illa hora possedi? Non possum indicare tibi, quam bene mihi cessit, nec nunc quidem dicere expedit. Plus desiderare non potui, præsentem Illo quem solum dilexi. O quantum dilexi quando me et omnia neglexi. De omni re quæ me delectare potuisset parum vel nihil curavi, quia ejus amor me totum rapuit, et quidquid Ipse non erat incongruum videbatur et insipidum. Quo ablato projectum est cor meum pene extra me. Dependebat enim anima mea ex gratia ejus

draws Himself.¹ Now we would appeal to the candour of our readers, and ask, speaking of Anglo-Catholic publications generally, whether an intimate and profound knowledge of the life of God in the soul is to be gained from them? On the contrary the writers usually at least ignore the subject of Christian experience, or treat it as an unreality, mere excited feeling and enthusiasm.

Again: the defectiveness of Anglo-Catholic teaching on faith is equally clear. In Evangelical publications the subject is prominently brought forward, though the true doctrine is obscured and corrupted by an erroneous teaching on justification. The joys and privileges of the inward life are also described by Evangelical writers generally, in accordance with the teaching of S. Paul and of saintly experience. The erroneous view in some respects of Evangelicalism on faith has no doubt been the main reason why the subject, amongst writers of Church principles, has fallen into neglect, and that we find in their works no attempt to embody the Apostle's teaching on faith, nor to give the subject in its various aspects that prominence which it unquestionably holds in S. Paul's epistles. But let it be borne in mind that we cannot without spiritual loss or danger, neglect or ignore any portion of God's word, and also that the subject of faith at the present day in some of its bearings at least, is of great interest and importance. Consider the definition of faith by S. Paul: "It is," he says, "the firmly grounded assurance (*ὑπόστασις*) of things hoped for, the demonstration (*ἔλεγχος*) of things not seen," (Heb. xi. 1.) Now is not the especial trial of many in the present day a temptation to unbelief? A person, e.g., thinks that modern writers have advanced satisfactory proof of the truth of certain theories on cosmogony or astronomy, which are apparently contradictory to the statements of the Bible, and thus that he has only the alternative of rejecting the

que aliud non habuit solatium nisi hunc quem plango subtractum."—Soliloquium Animæ, c. xiv.

¹ Thus also in the well-known hymn, ascribed to S. Bernard :

"Quando cor nostrum visitas
Tunc lucet ei veritas,
Mundi vilescit vanitas,
Et intus fervet charitas.
Mi Jesu quando venies,
Me lætum quando facies,
Ut me Teipso saties."

The same teaching will also be found in the Breviary hymn, *Commune Sanctorum ad Laudes*.

"Lux alma Jesu mentium,
Dum corda nostra recreas,
Culpæ fugas caliginem,
Et nos reples dulcedine,
Quam lætus est quem visitas.
Splendor Paternæ gloriæ,
Incomprehensa charitas,
Nobis amoris copiam
Largire per presentiam."

teaching of Holy Scripture, or of disbelieving the "facts," as he deems them, of modern science. Such is an especial trial of our own day, probably to some a severe one. Is it not then of the highest importance to bring forward prominently the Apostle's teaching, that we may all find the true ground of reliance in such intellectual difficulties and trials—a faith in God founded on love to Him which neither expects nor asks for overpowering evidence (as it were) of the truth of His word, as if belief were impossible till every difficulty was explained and every doubt satisfactorily answered, but is willing to receive and embrace the truth, even if it be so, upon imperfect or defective evidence, guided by the affections of a renewed heart, which can only find satisfaction and happiness in loving and serving its Creator and Redeemer?

Sufficient proof has, we think, been given that Anglo-Catholics, no less than their Evangelical brethren, may fairly be charged with falling short of the standard of Pauline theology. We gladly admit that much improvement has latterly taken place in Anglo-Catholic publications, and that many recent works cannot justly be charged with suppressing or not giving due prominence to the inner or spiritual teaching of the Gospel: but the voice of warning is still needed, since it cannot be doubted that a prejudice often exists among sincere and religious members of our Church against Anglo-Catholic teaching, as being inconsistent on the subjects which have been named with that of S. Paul, and we ought honestly to ask ourselves whether this prejudice rests on insufficient or merely imaginary ground: is it not the true reason why Evangelicalism appears to obtain a lasting hold upon some persons, that its teaching embraces certain portions of truth necessary to their soul's health which Anglo-Catholic clergy too generally ignore or lose sight of? This is a matter which deserves our very serious consideration.

An *eirenicon* has lately been proposed by a well-known learned and devout writer; but is there not a duty nearer home which first claims the attention of English churchmen? Ere we can form a portion of Christendom united in one body, the parties into which the Anglican Church is divided must be reconciled and united, their present divisions render a general union difficult, and almost impracticable. The Pauline theology embraced in its completeness, will join Evangelical and Anglo-Catholic together in one united brotherhood. The two parties will be mutually benefited. The Anglo-Catholic will then escape the danger of mere formalism, or of attaching too much importance to what is outward and ceremonial in religion, and realize in its fullest sum a truth now only imperfectly understood, and too often forgotten, that in our LORD's words, "the kingdom of God is within you," is not, as S. Paul says, "meat and drink, but righteousness, and peace, and joy in the HOLY GHOST;" he will also learn to give due prominence in *its* many bearings to faith, to his own spiritual knowledge and im-

provement; whilst on the other hand Evangelicalism being united to Catholic doctrine will rest on an assured basis of certainty, and the spiritual truths which it holds, and which now only preserve it from utter extinction, will be purified from error, and exert their full influence for the guidance and comfort of the Christian.

A few remarks shall be added to recommend and enforce our plea for Christian unity. The Divine Revelation, let it be remembered, must and also can only be received to our spiritual profit in its entirety: each part must be held in connexion with the whole, and if held separately and in disconnection from other truths may be positively mischievous and dangerous, conveying to our souls darkness and error instead of spiritual life and health. It is an awful truth that Evangelicalism, notwithstanding the saintly fruits of many of its adherents, on account of its one-sidedness,—holding certain portions of truth in an isolated state, and not in their true position and bearing as regards other truths,—may be the great hindrance amongst ourselves to the union of Christendom; its spirituality imperfect and erroneous as separated from Catholic truth, and its doctrine of the priesthood for the same reasons one-sided and defective,¹ have too generally leavened the religious portion of our people, and filled them with the most bitter prejudice against the Catholic faith. We have spoken of the spiritual teaching of Evangelicalism as imperfect and erroneous, but we wish to add further, that were it even the pure and genuine teaching of the Apostle himself, it could only, when separated from the dogmas of Catholicity, lead into most delusive and unscriptural errors. Thus men who “love the LORD JESUS CHRIST in sincerity,” are raising a stumbling-block to the fulfilment of His dying prayer, since it is only through the union of His people in one body that the object of His incarnation can be realized, and He can “draw all men unto Him.” “Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word, that they all may be one, as Thou, FATHER, art in Me and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us, *that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me.*” (S. John xvii.)

[Out of respect to the author of this series of learned and able Papers we have let pass what he says concerning the relation of faith and love. For ourselves, however, we still adhere to the ordinary view, that it is faith in the power and will of CHRIST to save, that first draws persons to CHRIST, and that love is a later growth in the soul, the perfecting of faith.]

¹ The error of Evangelicalism on the Doctrine of the Priesthood may be called a half-truth. All believers, they say, are priests, (1 S. Peter ii. 5, 9; Rev. i. 6,) which is undoubtedly true, but not inconsistent with the teaching of the Church, that there is *also* a higher order of priesthood,—the figurative priesthood, as it may be termed, of all Christians, and the real Priesthood of the Church are in strict accordance with Catholic teaching, and fully reconcilable together.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

1. *Fasciculus*. Apud J. Parker et soc. : Londini et Oxonii.
2. *Translations from Pindar into English Blank Verse*. By HUGH SEYMOUR TREMENEERE, late Fellow of New College, Oxford. London : Edward Moxon and Co.

WE gladly welcome these two volumes as indications that the love of scholarship is not yet become extinct amongst us. The first of the two is the joint production of Dr. Thornton, Head-Master of Epsom College, and of Messrs. Gidley, Russell-Baker, and Edward Walford, all Alumni of Oxford. It consists chiefly of translations from well-known passages of English poets, and is quite worthy to rank with other similar productions, which, in our day, have usually proceeded from Cambridge. The appendix contains two original hymns by Dr. Thornton, which show that he has been a careful student of mediæval hymnology.

Mr. Tremeneere's volume is also worthy of high praise. He is an ardent admirer of Pindar, a good scholar, and a very fair versifier. He has acted very wisely also, we think, in only translating those parts of his author which are most free from mythological allusions, or mere local interests. It may be also that he has chosen that in which he felt that he was most likely to be successful; but we cannot think that epic ten-syllabled verse is the proper equivalent for Pindar's free lyrical odes, though it may serve very well to express the more didactic portions of them which Mr. Tremeneere has chiefly chosen for translation. In fact it is the sentiments of Pindar, if we may judge from the Introduction, that he is anxious to commend to the English reader, rather than those qualities which give him rank as a poet.

A Catechism of Theology. Masters.

THIS is the first attempt, so far as we know, to supply our people with anything complete and definite on the great subjects of their belief, which are also, unhappily, subjects of controversy. Such Catechisms, both in controversial and in uncontroversial forms, abound among Roman Catholics, and it was high time that something should be attempted for members of the Church of England.

In the absence of any author's name, we have looked very closely to the definition of the most important doctrines, and find them thoroughly accurate, while they are expressed with that fulness of detail, which alone makes them intelligible and interesting to the general reader.

This Catechism will be especially useful to school-teachers, and might well form the basis of instruction to the first classes in our parish schools. At the same time there are very few of the parochial clergy who may not benefit by it.

Amongst Sermons, we have a worthy tribute to the memory of Mr. Keble, preached before the University of Oxford, by Archdeacon CHURTON; *The Power of Holy Minstrelsy* (Parker;) an excellent ordination sermon from the same publisher, by the Dean of Cape Town, *Thyself and the Doctrine*; three sermons, beautifully got up, by Mr. PURCHAS, of S. Paul's, Brighton, *The Death of Ezekiel's Wife*, (Bosworth;) and two sermons, preached at Cambridge, by Canon CARUS, (Deighton, Bell and Co.) on a subject which is now worn threadbare, *The Inspiration of Scripture*.

Sunday Morning in Leather Lane, (Rivingtons,) is one of those many useful contributions to a better knowledge of the sad state of our poor, which is gradually being brought home to us.

The Curates' Augmentation Society have put forth a paper, *On the Position and Prospects of Stipendiary Curates*, (Rivingtons,) which we hope will meet with a large circulation.

Dr. LOWE, the energetic and successful Master of S. John's, Hurstpierpoint, has published *Erasmii Colloquia Selecta: arranged for Translation and Re-Translation*. (Parker.) It is an attempt to make boys learn Latin as a living rather than as a dead language, and we certainly think that it is worth a trial. Arnold's, and other kindred elementary books, certainly fail in communicating anything like a useful vocabulary to boys.

CORRESPONDENCE.

THE SARUM ORDER OF COLOURS.

To the Editor of the Ecclesiastic.

SIR,—In your notice of my translation of the "Liturgy of the Church of Sarum," you mention with approval my endeavour to throw light upon the colours employed in that rite. Since my book was published the first part of the "Annotated Prayer Book" has been issued; and as the order there given differs in some respects from mine, and as the subject is especially important just at present, perhaps you will allow me to state briefly my reasons for upholding the correctness of my own as opposed to Mr. Perry's theory of the subject.

In the "Prayer Book" *blue* is suggested as the "probable" use for the ferial days in Advent: while "red or purple" is assigned to the ferial days in Lent: the Ember seasons, Rogation days and Vigils being marked as "uncertain." In my scheme, *blue* is given as constituting co-ordinately with *green*, the ordinary ferial colour: while *grey* and *brown* are assigned as being with *violet* the penitential colours. The reason why Mr. Perry regards *blue* as the Advent colour is, probably, because he considers it a mere variation of *violet*, the ordinary penitential colour of the West; but why he makes an arbitrary distinction between the week-days in Advent and the week-days in Lent, assigning "blue" to the one and "red or purple" to the

other, I am unable to see. I cannot find a trace of "light blue" being used, as Mr. Perry states, in commemorations of the Blessed Virgin. Nor do I consider, for reasons which I have entered into at length in my Preface, his appeal to certain "illuminations" of the fifteenth century, as a satisfactory proof of the use of "a somewhat darker shade" of that colour in funerals.

However there happens to exist distinct documentary proof in favour of my own, as opposed to Mr. Perry's theory of the colours. I allude to "the Order to be taken in proceeding from the Palace of Westminster to Windsor with the Corps," at the funeral of K. Henry VIII., Feb. 1547, which is preserved among the State Papers, and which directs, *inter alia*, that, "on Sunday the 13th day of February, and the day afore the removing," "three solemn masses, viz., one of Our Lady, another of the Trinity, (i.e. ferial,) and the third of Requiem," should be sung in the chapel of the palace. "The first in suits of WHITE;" (this disposes of the "light blue" theory in commemorations of the Blessed Virgin.) "The second in suits of BLUE," (this gives blue as the ferial or Trinity colour, not as the Advent.) "And the third in suits of BLACK," (and this disproves "a darker shade of blue" to have been the colour employed in the Office for the Dead.)

I will briefly notice two other points, in which it seems to me that Mr. Perry has needlessly obscured the matter he is endeavouring to elucidate. In liturgical language every male saint, whether bishop, priest, abbot, or laic, who is not a martyr, is styled a "confessor." There is then no reason for doubting, that, in assigning *yellow* as the colour for the festival of "one or many confessors," the Sarum rite contemplated not only that of a (lay) confessor, but also of a bishop, and a doctor, and "a holy man," (whether that may be as distinct from "confessor,") yet Mr. Perry restricts yellow to the former, and classes all the rest as "uncertain!"

The other point is his allusion to "other colours sometimes mentioned in inventories, such as brown, murray, pink, and cheyney, and "combinations of colours," such as "red and green," &c. With the exception of brown, of which there are sufficient instances to warrant us in regarding it as an ecclesiastical colour in the Sarum rite, the other colours are evidently shades merely of the recognised hues. Most of the inventories, I fear, were drawn up rather in the spirit of a auctioneer than in that of a ritualist; and hence the articles were described with a minuteness of detail, which suggests rather the thought of how much the sequestered ones would "fetch," than to what use the allowed ones would serve in the Sanctuary.

May I take this opportunity of correcting a mistake, into which inadvertently fell, in describing the Roman "ablutions" as *three*. In the Roman rite a priest only takes two ablutions, a bishop three. In the Sarum rite, on the contrary, the ablutions (at least at Hig Mass,) were always three: the third consisting in the water which the subdeacon poured over the priest's fingers into the chalice, an which the celebrant afterwards consumed.

Your obedient servant,

CHARLES WALKER.

4, Belgrave Place, Brighton.

THE ANNOTATED BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER.

The Annotated Book of Common Prayer ; being an Historical, Ritual, and Theological Commentary on the Devotional System of the Church of England. By JOHN HENRY BLUNT, M.A., author of "Directorium Pastorale," "Household Theology," &c. Part I. Rivingtons.

It is a pleasant feeling, doubtless, as it has often been described, **that** of the trader who is conscious that he is beginning to realise **property**. He has had for some years a certain amount of capital **embarked** in his business, but it would have been difficult for him **at** any time to lay his hands upon it, or say where it was, or what it amounted to. He may have been used to strike a kind of **periodical** balance between the debtor and creditor sides of his ledger, but he knew all along that the value of his investments **was** liable to fluctuate considerably, his speculations might turn **out** badly, his bankers, or other agents, might be guilty of fraud ; **a** bad season, or a panic, might at any moment force him into the "Gazette." But now, at length, he has become possessed of real **property**. Broad acres and solid streets, these are things about which there can be no mistake. His eye surveys their extent, and **he** finds in the contemplation of these a sense of security and a **pleasurable** sensation, to which before he was an entire stranger.

Something of this kind is the feeling of which, from time to time, we become now conscious, as in the discharge of our critical functions, month after month, we take up volume after volume, which puts forth as recognised and admitted truth, views which, a few years since, we stood almost alone in advocating.

This is very strikingly the case in reference to the subjects touched on in the Introduction to this handsome volume, which we cannot doubt is destined to take rank as *the* commentary on the English Prayer Book. The part of the Introduction which is of most permanent value is that which treats of the Theory of Divine Worship. It is supplied by Dr. Dykes and the editor, who (as is unavoidable when a subject is distributed between several writers) rather overlap the one the other. This chapter should in all reason have stood first, and might well have commenced with an analytical inquiry into the theory of worship before proceeding to discuss ceremonial details. There is no doubt that worship is at once an instinct and a revelation, the performance of which, under the Gospel, has been committed to the Church, which S. Paul tells us, in his Epistle to the Ephesians, has for this very purpose been constituted, in order that it may set forth God's glory "to principalities and powers in heavenly places."

Sacrifice, from the days of man's innocence, was a constituent part of worship, and so it is rightly shown how that is the highest kind of worship, which is associated with the highest sacrifice, viz., the sacrifice of the altar.

All this is excellently set forth in the Introduction, as well as the type of the apocalyptic worship, and the illustrations furnished in the Acts of the Apostles and the Epistles. Only we miss any reference to the remarkable passage in S. Paul's first Epistle to S. Timothy, which, rightly translated, should stand thus: "I will that those who are men in every place should offer up the prayers, lifting up holy hands without passion and without doubting." This may be called the great charter for the priesthood of the laity, who, in the discharge of this function, become a royal priesthood, offering up spiritual sacrifices acceptable to God by JESUS CHRIST; and this service of theirs no more interferes with the ordinance of a special priesthood, than it did in the case of the Jews, about whose priesthood there can be no question, but of whom it was said emphatically "Ye are a kingdom of priests." (Exod. xix. 6.)

The use and office of music in the services of the sanctuary is ably and feelingly advocated by Dr. Dykes, from whom we borrow one of those thoughtful and original ideas, such as he has often enriched the pages of the *Ecclesiastic* with. It is a note upon S. Paul's direction for the use of "psalms and hymns, and spiritual songs."

"In this threefold division it is scarcely possible to miss some special secret relation with the three several Persons of the ever-blessed Trinity. (1.) The 'Psalms,' flowing to us from, and uniting us to, the Old Dispensation, primarily lead us up to, and reveal to us, 'the FATHER of an Infinite Majesty.' (2.) The 'Hymns,' originating, as we have seen, from the Eucharistic Hymn in the upper room, bring us into special connection with our LORD JESUS CHRIST. (3.) The 'Spiritual Songs,' as their very name indicates, rather represent the free, unrestrained outbreathings in holy song of that Divine SPIRIT which animates and inspires the Body of CHRIST. So that we find the *first* in our Psalters; the *second* chiefly in our Liturgical Hymns, 'Gloria in Excelsis,' 'Ter Sanctus,' and the like; the *third* in our metrical songs, or odes—those songs in which Christian feeling has ever delighted to find expression. The first class is rather occupied with GOD Himself; the second, with GOD in His dealings with man, through the One Mediator; the third, with man in his dealings with GOD, through the Spirit of GOD quickening him. Reverence and devotion speak in the first, dogma finds utterance in the second, Christian emotion in the third."—P. IV.

On the question of the *quality* of music best fitted for the rendering of the Psalter, Dr. Dykes unfortunately, it is well known, is not Gregorian. This tendency, as we regret it on general grounds, so specially does it constitute a real drawback to the merit of the work before us; for we think it cannot be doubted

that the almost unanimous sense of Catholic-minded men is in favour of keeping at least the Psalms of David to that music, which at least has a prescription of 1,500 years in its favour, and to which, it must in all fairness be allowed, it was the intention of the English reformers to adhere.

The fact is that this is much more of a theological than of a musical question. It may be hard, we admit, for modern musicians, like Dr. Dykes and Sir Frederick Ouseley, to forego the richness of modern harmony; but still, if they are true Catholics, they will not hesitate to make the sacrifice. Dr. Dykes reminds us that the Church is indebted for the introduction of metrical hymns to the zeal of heretics. We do not say that Anglican chants are essentially heretical; but it would be well-nigh impossible to imagine the Psalter being sung, year by year, according to the time-honoured "Hour Services" of the Church, to Mercer's, or Turle's, or Ouseley's collection of chants.

And here we are constrained to notice two points in which Dr. Dykes (we feel sure quite unintentionally) has not been quite fair. In the first he is speaking of Merbeck's Prayer Book, which it is well known gives the 8th tone 1st ending for the *Venite*, and adds, "and so forth with the rest of the Psalms." After quoting these words it is scarcely just to say, "there is no proof that it was intended to fasten" the old ecclesiastical tones on the English Church. We see nothing of a "tentative or experimental character" in this which was done under Cranmer's immediate direction, but quite the reverse. It seems to us just the parallel to the initiatory rubric about chancels: it is a plain indication that in all ways it was the purpose of those who revised her services in the 16th century to adhere to the ancient landmarks alike in practice as in doctrine.

The other point to which we must advert occurs in treating of the music used by the Jews in the chanting of the Psalter. An "impenetrable veil," he had already said, hangs over the whole subject of "the ancient Jewish ritual song, music having been authoritatively banished from the synagogue ever since the destruction of Jerusalem, the nation deeming its duty to be rather to mourn over its misfortunes in penitential silence until the coming of Messiah, (as of course they reckon,) than to exult in songs of praise."

We do not see how this statement is to be reconciled with the statement further on in the book that "Padre Martini collected a great number of the Hebrew chants which were sung in the different synagogues throughout Europe." Certainly also our own experience contradicts the statement of modern Jews not using music in their services. But what we complain of is that in admitting that one chant (out of the few given by Dr. Burney) bears a strange resemblance to an old Church tone, he should go out of his way to say that the resemblance was "probably purely accidental."

Musically we admit that the derivation of the old Church tones from David's chants is not capable of demonstration,—but the frantic efforts that are made by the musicists to discredit such a theory,—as, e.g., Sir F. Ouseley's theory put forth at Manchester, that they are borrowed from Persia,—only seem to us to argue a determination to reject them at all hazards. We wish much that some competent person would undertake the examination of the whole question, but to us it seems incredible that S. Ignatius, (if it was he who first introduced antiphonal singing into the Christian Church,) could have ventured on attempting a new system of chanting David's Psalms, when he could not but be aware that there was a system of chanting them with which half his congregation were familiar, which claimed to be divine in its origin. At all events we protest against a writer telling us on one page that nothing is to be learnt concerning the old Jewish music, and on another affirming that their music certainly had not those characters which subsequently have been termed Gregorian.

In the historical portion of the Introduction the most valuable feature is that which shows that a revision of the Church's services in the sixteenth century was considered by all persons a necessity quite independently of doctrinal views. A new and confessedly temporary edition of the Sarum Breviary had been published by Wolsey in 1516, and another edition came out in 1581. Both of these contained principles that were new; and Tyndale's translation of the Bible had already appeared. Quignonez's edition of the Breviary appeared in 1536, from the preface to which our Revisers so largely borrow. Primers and other elementary manuals using more or less the vernacular tongue had been in general circulation; and then prior to the Prayer Book of 1549 the Litany in English had been published in 1544, and the "Ordinance for receiving the Body of our LORD under both kinds," viz., of "bread and wine," in 1547.

And this view receives the strongest confirmation from the original preface of the Prayer Book, which unfortunately receives no illustration whatever from Mr. Blunt, but which really of course is the key to the whole mind of the English Reformation. In this remarkable document, ("Concerning the Service of the Church,") as we have pointed out on former occasions, there is not a word said about any intention of altering doctrines. It was a *bona fide* revision of services alone that was aimed at in the new Prayer Book, and this preface enumerates as many as five points in which revision was emphatically required.

We trust that in a new edition Mr. Blunt will remedy this very capital defect of his work, and call attention to the importance and significance of this document.

Of Mr. Perry's share in the Introduction it is scarcely necessary for us to speak, as of course it is just the counterpart of his contri-

bution to Mr. Shipley's volume of "Essays," which we have already noticed.

We come now to the body of the work, or at least the first instalment of it. We have already had occasion to notice one omission in this preliminary portion; for the rest we have only the more grateful task of approving. The Minor Festivals are well treated by Mr. Fowler, of S. John's, Hurstpierpoint. Underneath the monthly calendar are arranged the Eastern, the modern Roman, that of the Salisbury use, and one given by the Venerable Bede, so that all may be compared at a glance. The obligation on each Priest to use the Daily Office publicly or privately is plainly set forth, and there are two valuable passages quoted from Tertullian and S. Cyprian which mark prayers "at the beginning of *day* and *night*" as a special law of the Church; and as this has recently been called in question, we are glad to meet with this vindication. Reference might also have been made to the Morning and Evening Sacrifice of the Mosaic ritual. The right etymology of the word *Collect*, we are glad to see, is given from Durandus.

With the treatment of the Daily Office itself we are not quite so well satisfied. In the first place we miss any attempt at dividing the Service into its constituent elements of praise and prayer; or any analysis of the essential idea of worship. On the other side, an "Expository Paraphrase of the Creed" seems here rather out of place. In the directions for the uses of the first Collect, a mistake occurs which we should not have expected to find, ordering the entire omission of the Sunday Collect (except in the great seasons of the Church) when any Festival falls on the Sunday. The Sunday Collect is not superseded, but should be used *after* that of the Festival. (Mr. Blunt does not appear to give any directions with regard to the use of Lessons on these days.) But the most important defect is found in the notes on the Absolution. The Editor is anxious evidently to vindicate it from the irreverent and unbecoming treatment which it has received of late in certain quarters; but his defence is not conducted on theological principles. There is no distinction made between the different kinds of sins, and he does not seem to have apprehended the points on which the question turns. No one acquainted with liturgiology would doubt that the declaratory form of Absolution might be effective for the remission of sin. Therefore it is altogether beside the purpose to say that "to declare God's pardon of sinners is to give effect to that pardon, as when the authorised subordinate of an earthly sovereign declares pardon in that sovereign's name." The question is simply this, under what conditions alone is a priest authorised to give absolution to a penitent? The conditions manifestly are twofold. 1. He must be conversant with the nature of the sins committed, (which can only be by private confession;) and 2, he must be satisfied that there is sufficient penitence mani-

fested,—including, if need be, compensation. This cannot of course take place in reference to a miscellaneous congregation, and therefore it is plain there can be no real exercise of the power of the keys intended. It is impossible that any one who has reflected on the awfulness of the Priest's prerogative can suppose that he could venture to dispense this highest of God's trusts in this haphazard kind of way. The Priest is directed not only to "remit," but also to "retain." Surely this implies the exercise of a discretion and discrimination which is impossible when he is addressing a mixed congregation.

The arguments used to prove that when there is no anthem the five last prayers need not be used, seem to us to partake very much of special pleading. At Evensong the writer is obliged to admit that there is no ground whatsoever for his theory. We must add also that the comment on the Prayer of S. Chrysostom is specially inadequate; omitting to notice that it is an address to the Second Person in the Holy Trinity, and making no reference to the interpretation which it puts, (and which is now so generally lost sight of by commentators,) on our LORD's words, "When two or three are gathered together in My Name." They refer only to the Church's corporate acts—not to any miscellaneous aggregation of worshippers.

It is strange that the fact of the Magnificat being founded on the Song of Hannah is not pointed out. We regret also to observe that the *Gloria Patri* is not traced to its true origin, viz., the spontaneous outburst of praise from those who were privileged to witness the martyrdom of S. Polycarp.

An excellent feature in this, as in all other parts of the volume, is the printing the original of the prayers in a column parallel with the English.

The Litany is excellently annotated by Mr. Bright, who seems to us to have just attained the medium between saying too much and too little.

The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels (which terminate the first part of the volume) do not need much annotation. But there is supplied in this part information which could only be gained by reference to a variety of sources. Instead of printing the lections from Holy Scripture, (which would have been a work of supererogation,) there is after every collect a comparative table of the Sarum Use, the Roman and the Eastern; and in the notes are given the ancient Introits, and the Hymns for the week as known by their titles. The Hymns are contributed by the Rev. P. G. Medd.

We have thought it right to enter somewhat minutely upon the examination of the Annotated Prayer Book, because it is a kind of work that must attain at once to something of authority. Nothing of equal pretension has ever been published upon the Prayer Book, and there is no doubt that it will be consulted largely by

candidates for Holy Orders. And our verdict respecting it is that while taken as a whole, it is considerably in advance of any of its predecessors,—as certainly the last work should be the best,—it will require extensive revision before it can be said to be an adequate Commentary on the Prayer Book of the Church of England. In some respects the second part might contain the corrections that we desire to see effected.

As a specimen of the book, as well as for the sake of much valuable matter contained in it, we will give the greater part of the comment on the *Te Deum*. First there is a very fair critical inquiry into the history of the Hymn, (of which we simply give the result,) and then come certain remarks (1) on its ritual use, and (2) in explanation of its construction and meaning.

"The most probable conclusion to arrive at is, that this noble canticle, in its present form, is a composition of the fourth or fifth century; and that it represents a still more ancient hymn, of which traces are to be found in S. Cyprian and the Morning Hymn of the Alexandrine Manuscript.

"The *Te Deum* is only known as connected with the ritual of the Church. It seems also from the first to have been connected with the reading of the Morning Lessons, the expression 'keep us this day without sin,' being some evidence of this, though not convincing, as an analogous form is used in 'Give us this day our daily bread.' In the Salisbury Use, which probably represents the more ancient use of the Church of England, it was directed to be sung after the last lesson on Sundays and other Festivals, except during Advent and the Lenten season from Septuagesima to Easter. Quignonez, in his reformed Roman Breviary, directed it to be used every day even in Lent and Advent. The Prayer Book of 1549 ordered it to be used every day, with the exceptions customary according to the older ritual; and as festivals were previously almost of daily occurrence, this was practically a continuance of the old rule. In 1552 the exceptions were erased, and have not since been restored; but as the alternative Canticle, *Benedicite*, remains, some ritualists conclude that it is to be used in Lent and Advent as directed by the First Book of Edward VI., and not the *Te Deum*.¹ Of ritual customs anciently connected with the singing of this

¹ "This is not the ancient practice of the Church, it must be remembered. During Advent the following was sung instead of *Te Deum* on all Festivals when the latter would otherwise have been used. It is the last of nine *Responso* (*Responso*) used after the nine Lessons respectively.

"Rz. 9. *Lætentur coeli, et exultet terra: jubilate montes laudem: quia Dominus noster venit. Et pauperum suorum miserebitur.*

"V. *Orietur in diebus ejus justitia et abundantia pacis. Et pauperum suorum miserebitur.*

"Gloria Patri, et Filio, et Spiritui Sancto:

"Et pauperum suorum miserebitur."

"The ancient ritual use of the *Benedicite* was entirely festive; though it was not indeed set aside from its place in the Lauds during Lent and Advent.

"Admirable substitutes for the *Te Deum* in Lent and Advent might be found in two other of the discontinued Lauds Canticles, the Song of Hezekiah (*Isa. xxxviii.*) being exactly adapted for Lent, and that of Habakkuk (*Hab. iii.*) being equally

hymn, one still retains a strong hold upon English people, viz., that of bowing at the words 'Holy, Holy, Holy,' with the same reverent gesture that is used in the Creed: a custom derived from the angelic reverence spoken of in Isaiah in connexion with the same words. 'And for bycause Angels praise God with great reverence, therefore ye incline when ye sing their song,' says the Mirror.

"Besides the use of the Te Deum in the Morning Service, there is a well-known custom of singing this triumphal hymn, by itself, arranged to elaborate music, as a special service of thanksgiving. It is directed to be used in this manner, in 'Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea after Victory, or deliverance from an Enemy:' and at the conclusion of coronations it is always so used, as it has been, time immemorial, over the whole of Europe. The Sovereigns of England have been accustomed to go in state to the singing of the Te Deum after great victories, and Handel's 'Dettingen Te Deum' was composed for one of these occasions. Custom has also established this separate use of the Te Deum on other important occasions of thanksgiving.

"The most ancient Christian music known has come down to us in connexion with this Canticle; being that known as the 'Ambrosian Te Deum,' which is found in a work on music written by Boëthius, a Roman Consul, in A.D. 487. This is, however, thought to be an adaptation of the Temple psalmody of the Jews, like the other ancient Church tones.

"A very striking characteristic of this heavenly hymn is the strictly doctrinal form in which it is composed, which makes it a literal illustration of St. Paul's words, 'I will sing with the spirit, and I will sing with the understanding also.' (1 Cor. xiv. 15.) It has been thought by some, from the singularity of the opening words, *Te Deum*, that it is throughout a hymn to CHRIST as GOD, representing, or analogous to, that spoken of by Pliny in his letter to Trajan. But the English version truly represents the Latin form, in which a double accusative is joined to the verb *laudamus* that could not be otherwise rhythmically translated. That the English Church has always considered the earlier verses of it to be addressed to the First Person of the Blessed Trinity is evidenced by the ancient Salisbury Antiphon to the Athanasian Creed, which is, 'Te Deum *Patrem* ingenitum, te *Filium* unigenitum, te *Spiritum Sanctum* Paracletum, sanctam et individuum Trinitatem toto corde et ore confitemur.' It has also been conjectured that the 11th, 12th, and 13th verses have been interpolated, but there is not the slightest ground for this conjecture, all ancient MSS. in Latin, Teutonic of the ninth century, and English from the ninth to the fourteenth, reading precisely the same: and the hymn being rendered imperfect by their omission.

"The first ten verses are an offering of praise to the FATHER Almighty, with the Scriptural recognition of the Blessed Trinity implied in the Ter Sanctus which Isaiah heard the Seraphim sing when he beheld the glory of CHRIST, and spake of Him. In the three following

suitable for Advent. The Salisbury version of the latter (from the Vulgate) had two beautiful renderings of the 13th and 18th verses: 'Thou wentest forth for the salvation of Thy people; even for salvation with Thy CHRIST;' and 'Yet I will rejoice in the LORD: I will joy in God my JESUS.'"

verses this implied recognition of the Three in One is developed into an actual ascription of praise to each, the *Pater immensæ Majestatis*, the *Unicus Filius*, and the *Sanctus Paracletus Spiritus*. In these thirteen verses the Unity and Trinity of the Divine Nature is celebrated in the name of the whole Church of God. The Militant Church, the various orders of holy Angels with which it has fellowship in the New Jerusalem, the Apostles, Prophets, and Martyrs of the Old and New Dispensation now gathered into the Church Triumphant, all thus adore God the LORD, the LORD GOD of Sabaoth, the FATHER Everlasting: and the holy Church gathers up its praises in a devout acknowledgment of each Person of the Blessed Trinity as the Object of Divine worship. Then begins that part of the Hymn which glorifies God for the blessing of the Incarnation: the latter sixteen verses addressing themselves to our LORD and SAVIOUR; commemorating His Divine Nature and Eternal Existence, His Incarnation, Sacrifice, Ascension, and Session at the right hand of the FATHER. In the last verses, with a mixture of plaintiveness and triumph, the hymn follows the line marked out by the Angels at the Ascension, looking to our LORD's Second Advent as the true complement of His First. This concluding portion is as well fitted to express the tone of a Church Militant as the initial portion is to express that of a Church Triumphant: and the personal form of the last verse is a touching reminder of the individual interest that each of us has in the corporate work of praise and prayer of which Divine Service is constituted. Few uninspired compositions give so clear an echo of the spirit and depth of Holy Scripture.

"There are three verses of the *Te Deum* which require special notice, with reference to the modern Latin and English in which they are given to us at the present day.

"(1) The ninth verse, '*Te Martyrum candidatus laudat exercitus*,' is very insufficiently rendered by 'The noble army of Martyrs praise Thee.' In pre-Reformation versions it stood,—'The preiseth the white coat of martiris;' and considering the distinct connexion between this verse and Rev. vii. 9, 14, it is strange that the Scriptural idea of 'white robes' which have been 'made white in the blood of the Lamb,' should have been superseded by the word 'noble.' It is possible that the idea of something lustrous and pure was more expressed by 'noble' in the early part of the sixteenth century, than is conveyed by it to modern ears;¹ but the change of the word from the old English 'white,' and Anglo-Saxon 'shining,' has gone far to obliterate the true sense of the original in our present version.

"(2) In the sixteenth verse, the ancient and modern English versions alike fail to give the full sense of the Latin. The former uniformly give, 'Thou wert nozt skoymes (squeamish) to take the maydenes wombe, to delyver man kynde,' which is little different in sense from our present version. But it is clear that 'Tu, ad liberandum, suscepturus hominem' includes a reference to the Incarnation, as much as 'non horruisti Virginis uterum.' The verse would be more literally rendered, 'Thou, being about to take manhood upon Thee, to deliver it;' but there is an almost insurmountable difficulty in the way of

¹ "So gold and silver were called 'noble metals' by the early chymists."

matching the point and rhythm of the Latin by an equivalent sentence in English.

“(3) The twenty-first verse has been altered both in Roman Breviaries and in the English Prayer Book. All Latin MSS. previous to 1492, read ‘Æterna fac cum sanctis Tuis gloria *munerari*.’ and the equivalent of *munerari* is found in every known version of the Te Deum up to that time; our own in the fourteenth century being, ‘Make hem to be rewarded with thi seyntes, in endles blisse.’ The ‘*numerari*’ reading appears to be an error of the early printers, arising out of the very slight difference presented by *mun* and *num* in black letter.¹ The word ‘*in*’ is a modern insertion of the same date, and probably arose from confusion between the twenty-first and eighteenth verses, in the latter of which occurs ‘*in gloria Patris*.’ Since our LORD said, ‘Great is your *reward* in Heaven,’ and ‘Himself shall *reward* you openly,’ the old English rendering of *munerari* is quite Scriptural; it may be pointed out that the sense of the Latin is rather that of free gift than reward, *munerari*, not *re-munerari*. Perhaps the original may be rendered, ‘Make them to be awarded with Thy saints: Thy glory everlasting,’ without departing from the sense of the original, or the familiar rhythm of our Prayer Book version. The received version, although not faithful to the original, is happily comprehensive; for, to be ‘numbered with the children of God,’ and to have a ‘lot among the saints,’ is to receive the ‘great recompense of reward,’ the heavenly heritage, of those who are joint heirs with CHRIST of His triumphant kingdom. —Pp. 11—13.

ALFORD'S ENGLISH NEW TESTAMENT.

The New Testament for English Readers: containing the Authorized Version, with a revised English Text, Marginal References, and critical and explanatory Commentary. By HENRY ALFORD, D.D. Dean of Canterbury. Vol. II. Part II., the Epistle to the Hebrews, the Catholic Epistles, and the Revelation, 8vo. pp. 842.

WHY Dean Alford should call a large handsome octavo volume of between eight and nine hundred pages, a “part” of a volume we cannot tell. The so-called first part of this second volume is nearly as large a book as the one before us; this edition of the New Testament being contained in four handsome volumes, which most unreasonably are numbered, volumes I. and II., containing two parts in each volume. Dean Alford is not alone in this absur-

¹ “It should, however, be mentioned that the Venerable Bede, who was almost contemporary with Gregory the Great, records some words of his which contain something very like this reading. ‘Sed et in ipsa missarum celebratione tria verba maximæ perfectionis plena superadjecit, ‘Diesque nostros in tua pace disponas, atque ab æterna damnatione nos eripi, et in electorum tuorum jubeas grege *numerari*.’”—Bede, Hist. Eccl., lib. 2, c. i. 87.”

ity; we can only regret that his own naturally good sense did not lead him to insist upon the volumes of this edition of his New Testament being called by their proper name.

With the work itself, in its original form, every scholar of the New Testament who has any pretension to any exegetical learning must be well acquainted. It embodies the result of twenty-four years of hard, careful, and unsparing labour, which was undertaken by one who, from his classical training and the classical honours which he gained at his own University, must be considered to have been eminently fitted for his task. In Dean Alford we find combined an earnest and simple faith with a firm, vigorous, and manly tone of thought. Critics may differ as to the grounds upon which the text of the New Testament has been constructed; as to the advisability of importing so large an amount of German theology into his notes: as to his prudence in deciding against the orthodox upon some of the *questiones vexatæ* of the day; but they will all agree in saying that his book is an immense advance upon any of its predecessors. It is no slight gain to have the principles of textual criticism placed within the range of the many, and to have them illustrated by thousands of examples. It is a greater gain to have the opinions, nay, more, sometimes even the very words themselves, of an infinite number of expositors of every school brought together in the five volumes of the Greek Testament and in the four volumes of this edition. It is the greatest gain of all, to have these multitudinous opinions, grouped into classes, their several merits determined upon by canons of criticism previously laid down, with a calm reliable judgment being delivered upon the whole. The Dean never shrinks from giving his own personal opinion upon disputed points. In all truthfulness we can say, that he never reasons away the higher objective mysteries of the Gospel into mere forms of subjective belief. Neither the actual person of our Blessed Lord, nor the outward application of His Sacraments, are reduced by him according to the modern theory, into a spurious idealism or expressions of faith and love. If then the great Commentaries of the Fathers, nay, even of the schoolmen, are not neglected, but utter their voice in company with Bengel, and Luther, and Calvin, and a host of Germans whose name is Legion; it may well be asked, what more could any reasonable man require in a Commentary upon the New Testament? We trust that we are not unreasonable, and yet we certainly require somewhat more than the Dean provides for us. We trust that we have intelligently followed the Dean as far as he goes, but we wish to descend deeper than he can take us, that so we may quaff of the hidden waters which are contained in the wells of salvation. This could not be the case, if all the writers whose names are cited in his pages were fairly represented, and that they are not so, is no fault of the Dean's, but flows from an endeavour to epitomize that which

cannot be epitomized, and to break up into minute portions that which, to be rightly understood, must be viewed as a whole. The intellectual qualifications of Origen differ from those of S. Augustine, who is as far removed from S. Chrysostom as this latter Father is from S. Thomas Aquinas. The bare opinion of any Father upon any disputed text of Holy Scripture by no means gives us any representation of the mind of that Father; of the peculiar cast of thought which he brings to bear, not only upon that, but upon the other portions of Holy Writ. It is this circumstance that makes all such encyclopedian commentaries but partially successful; it causes them to be inferior, for the unfolding of the mind of the Spirit, to the original work of any one great Father, whose writings nevertheless may not contain a hundredth part of the so-called information which is to be found in these modern books. For example, a student making himself thoroughly master of Origen's Commentary on the Epistle to the Romans, would enter into the spirit of that wonderful composition in a way which he never could do, did he confine himself to the reading of Alford, Wordsworth, *et hoc genus omne*. It is true, he would have but Origen's views and interpretations, which in some cases might need subsequent modification, and the proper course to take, would be to turn to the careful study of S. Chrysostom, when abundance of time had been allowed for the thorough digestion and realization of the Origenistic exegesis. Yes, this is one defect in books like Alford's, where so much is compressed into so small a space, that they are *hard of digestion*; that while you get certain orthodox and clear "views" from them they are unable to convey any deep or decided mental impression; so that even where the sense of Holy Scripture is thoroughly fathomed, the spirit of the inspired word is hardly communicated. It may truly be said then that if these modern epitomes of New Testament theology supply a great want, they leave a greater want unsupplied; that if they bring a vast amount of biblical lore without much trouble in the reach of the many, they leave them not overmuch gainers by the gift. This is the fault of the age and not of the good and holy painstaking men who are trying to do what they can for their day and generation; it is a special characteristic of this age in which many are running to and fro and in which knowledge seems to be increased.

As was mentioned in reviewing a former volume of this Series, (*Eccles.* Vol. xxvii. pp. 459—469, No. cliv.) it consists of the Greek Testament carefully translated, with the entire prolegomena of the original work, together with everything that could be rendered into English, and so add to the completeness of the work. As in the former volume, so also in this, an entirely new version of Dean Alford's restored text is given in parallel columns with the Authorized Version; while in the notes a more exact translation is often to be found than could with propriety be admitted into the version itself.

Some of these new construals in the Epistle to the Hebrews will at once catch the eye of the reader. "God, having in many portions" which is certainly a better rendering than the old one, of *πολυμερῶς*. On the change of reading we read as follows: "'At sundry times' (Auth. Ver.) is not an accurate rendering, nor can it be said to *express* the meaning: *time* is an historical condition of the sequence of parts—*persons to whom*, an anthropological condition,—but it does not follow that '*at sundry times*,' or '*to sundry persons*,' gives the force of '*in divers parts*:' because it might be the same thing which was revealed again and again. This revelation in portions, by fragments, in and by various persons, was necessarily an imperfect recitation, to which the one final manifestation in and by One Person is properly and logically opposed." We note, "when He had made purification of sins," instead of the old reading, because "by Himself" and "our" are not found in the most ancient MSS. For the "lest at any time we should let them slip" is read "lest haply we be diverted from them." The original use of the word is applied to food going the wrong way, or a ring falling from off the finger. We are to adhere to the things which we have heard, "that we do not at any time float past them," neither the tense nor the voice will support A. V. In chap. ii. ver. 16, the revised version reads "For, as we know, it is not angels that He helpeth, but it is the seed of Abraham that He helpeth:" *ἐπιλαμβάνεται* signifies, "takes by the hand," in order to assist and lead; the context speaking of those who have been helped by CHRIST. The A. V. even wrongly expresses the taking the nature by such a phrase as "He took on Him the seed." A remarkable reading is found in iv. 2, "Immingled as they were in faith," (*συγκεκρασμένους*) which is found in the Alexandrine, Vatican, Paris, and Claromontane MSS. "The passage," says Dean Alford, "is almost a desperate one . . . This interpretation does not satisfy me: but it seems the only escape from violation either of the rules of criticism or of those of grammar." It is a very pretty construing of ver. 9, "There is yet reward, therefore a keeping of Sabbath for the people of God." Note: "God's rest was a keeping of Sabbath: so also will ours be." An important piece of doctrine is taught in ver. 14 by the simple change of "through" for "into." CHRIST "passed through (not 'into' as A. V.) the heavens; as the earthly High Priest passed through the veil into the holiest place, so the Great High Priest through the heavens to God's throne . . . In this fact, His greatness is substantiated." The difficult expression as applied to our Blessed LORD, "And was heard in that He feared," is made much plainer by the new version giving "by reason of His reverent submission." Three meanings have been given in explanation of this difficult passage; that our LORD was heard on account of His pious resignation; that He was delivered from the thing which He feared; and He was heard by Him who was His fear. The Greek suits neither the second

nor the third of these explanations; the first being accepted without hesitation by the Dean. "Besides the fulfilling the requisites of philology and of fact it admirably suits the context here where the appointment of CHRIST by the FATHER to His High Priesthood, and the various steps by which that High Priesthood was perfected . . . the religious sense of this cautious fear suits remarkably well in our passage." We are sorry to find, though on good philological grounds, "the doctrine of baptisms," (vi. 2,) changed into "the doctrine of washings." Both Christian baptism and that of S. John are expressed by a different form of the noun. Παραπεσόντας (vi. 6,) is rightly construed, "and have fallen away" instead of A. V. "if they shall fall away." "And of all gainsaying an oath is to them an end for confirmation," (vi. 16,) clears up several difficulties which are involved in the question. "And an oath for confirmation is to them an end for all strife." The τετελειωμένον of vii. 28 is construed "*made perfect*." The A. V. has obliterated both sense and analogy with chap. ii. 10, and v. 9, by rendering this participle "*consecrated*." Estius and C. à Lapide consider "made perfect" as equal to consummated. "The Apostle opposes these perfections and consummations of CHRIST to the infirmity of the old priests." There is great excuse for our translators in this case, because they followed the LXX. readings in Exod. xxix. 10, 33; Lev. viii. 33; xvi. 32. Hesychius also gives τελειώσεις, ἀγιάσεις. The revised version giving "the *delineation* and shadow of the heavenly things;" the note adds, "the word [ὁπόμεγμα] cannot as in chap. iv. 11, mean a pattern or example but must be taken as meaning a suggestive representation or a sketch." A. V. reads "the example." Ch. ix. 1, "*The worldly sanctuary*," instead of *a*, brings out forcibly the opposition between the two sanctuaries. "The first covenant had not merely *a* worldly sanctuary, but the only sanctuary which was upon earth, that one which was constructed after the pattern of things in the heavens." Ch. ix. 11, in opposition to the Fathers is interpreted as CHRIST passing "*through* the greater and more perfect tabernacle" of the heavens; "through which CHRIST passed not only locally, but conditionally, being the abode of blessed spirits and just men made perfect," "not of this creation." "The rendering '*not of this building*,' A. V. is wrong and misses the idea, giving in fact a tautological explanation for '*not made with hands*.'" "And obtained" (ver. 12,) instead of "having obtained," A. V. is thus explained: "The redemption was not accomplished *when* He entered, but accomplished by His *entering*." In vers. 23, 24, we find "figures of things in the heavens," &c., "counterfeits of the true," in place of the old readings: "patterns of things," &c., and "the figures of the true." In the former case, the delineation or figures could not be patterns: "at least, not in the present acceptance of the word. The heavenly things themselves would be the patterns

or antitypes." The "counterfeits of the true," "literally antitypes correspondent to the type."

We are very glad to find Dean Alford venturing upon the reading, "and every high priest standeth day by day," &c.; which not only occurs in the oldest and best manuscripts, but has been admitted into the editions of Lachmann and Tischendorf. Several editors though fully believing in the claim of ἀρχιερεὺς, have shrunk from adopting it for certain theological reasons. The note on this reading is worthy of transcription :

"Much has of late been said against the reading of 'High Priest,' as bringing in an inaccuracy which our writer could not be guilty of, seeing that the *high* Priests did not officiate in the daily sacrifice. But all such arguments are worthless against our most ancient MSS., and tend indeed the other way, viz. to show how natural it was to alter *high priest* to *priest*, on account of this very difficulty. With regard to the alleged inaccuracy, I really think that if closely viewed, it will prove rather to be a fine and deep touch of truth. The High Priesthood of our Lord is to be compared with that of the Jewish legal high priests. On the one side is Jesus, alone in the glory of His office and the virtue of His sacrifice; on the other is the Jewish high priesthood, not one but many, by reason of death; represented in all its acts, personal and delegated, by its holder for the time, by '*every high priest*,' offering not one, but many sacrifices. This *High Priest* is the representative of the whole priesthood. Whether he minister in the daily service of the temple himself or not, it is he who embodies the acts and sufferings of Israel in his own person."

This representative view of the functions of the high priest seems in a very explicit manner to clear up the difficulty of the reading.

"A certain fearful looking for of judgment," (x. 27,) is construed, "a fearful receiving of judgment." The note is: "Reception (i.e. meed, doom :) not, as I believe universally interpreted without remark, *expectation*. The word used (ecdoche) appears never to have this sense, and this is the only place where it occurs in the New Testament. All which *remains* is, the reception of the doom of judgment." In xi. 13, instead of Archbishop Trenchard's reading, "and saluted them," our revised version gives, "and greeted them." "From afar they saw the promises in reality of their fulfilment, from afar they greeted them as the wanderer greets his longed for home even when he only comes in sight of it at a distance, drawing to himself as it were magnetically and embracing with inward love that which is yet afar off. The exclamation, 'I have waited for Thy salvation, O Lord,' Gen. xlix. 18, is such a salutation, such a greeting of salvation from afar." Such is the beautiful explanation of this passage which is taken from Delitzsch. Estius says that when they had dimly seen their heavenly country they were saluting it immediately by their desire for it. On the words, "we have an altar," the Dean though very positive hardly

allows the universal interpretation of the passage to have weight enough with him. He allows that although the word is not emphasised it still has a definite meaning. CHRIST is not the altar, He is superior to it and throws it into the shade. The heavenly place is only so inasmuch as it is an antitype of the cross, just as the cross is the antitype of the LORD's Table. "We want that altar itself: and that altar is, the cross, on which the LORD suffered. That is our altar: not to be emphasised, nor exalted into any comparison with the adorable Victim thereon offered; but still our altar, that wherein we glory, that for which, as for our altars, we contend: of which our banners, our tokens, our adornments, our churches, are full: severed from which, we know not CHRIST; laid upon which, He is the power of God, and the wisdom of God." This is all very true if the literal interpretation of the word was allowed in the first place. There is something grating and harsh in asserting that the LORD's Table "may be said to *represent* to us the Cross whereupon the sacrifice was offered, just as the bread and wine, laid on it, represent the oblation itself: but it is not the altar in any propriety of language, however we may be justified in common parlance in so calling it." For ourselves with S. Chrysostom, Theodoret, Theophylact, and Anselm, we are content to assert that Christians have no other altar from which they can eat than the *Table of the Lord*. It is remarkable that "who brought up from the dead the Great Shepherd," (xiii. 20,) is the only place in this Epistle where mention is made of the resurrection. The reason assigned for this as quoted by the Dean is that "everywhere else he [the writer] lifts his eyes from the depth of our LORD's humiliation passing over all that is intermediate to the highest point of His exaltation. The connection here suggests to him once at least to make mention of that which lay between Golgotha and the throne of God, between the Altar of the Cross and the heavenly sanctuary, the resurrection of Him Who died as our sin-offering."

We trust that Dean Alford's treatment of the Epistle to the Hebrews, in some of its most difficult passages may be gleaned from our few extracts. The continuous analysis of the whole which forms a very useful though subordinate running commentary can be best understood by an independent reference to the work itself. The critical labour here expended upon this Epistle is hardly so great as that which was required for the Apocalypse, and therefore does not so severely test his powers of criticism. We think that on the whole he has hardly done full justice to this wonderful development of almost sub-Apostolic teaching.

We shall now turn to the first Epistle of S. John and show some few of the merits and demerits of the Dean's exegesis of that Epistle taken almost exclusively from a theological point of view. It may be our own fancy, but we have always thought that the Dean has a

pecial love and reverence for "the Beloved Disciple;" it seems as if he never could dig down deep enough into that marvellous treasury of Divine light and love which is contained in his writings; it is as if he almost longed to go out of himself and so to enter into an entire oneness of thought and feeling with the Bishop of Ephesus. Much as the Dean has done in his sermons as well as by his commentary to elucidate the writings of S. John, we think that he might still do more. We should like to see him bring out a volume on S. John's first Epistle equally exhaustive though differing in tone to that which Professor Lightfoot has produced upon the Galatians.

1 S. John i. 2. The Word of life is taken to mean that personal Word Who is life as a designation for our LORD Himself Who had spoken of Himself in the Gospel as being Life, the Bread of Life, the Light of Life. Lorinus dwells upon the fact that He is not words of Life but the Word of Life. That Word which S. Athanasius says was seen in the flesh of the SON, that Word of the FATHER which was felt, which was handled. In a sense, He is the life-giving Word, in Whom we live, and move, and have our being: by Whom at the beginning all things were made.

On "our fellowship with the FATHER," the repeated "with" distinguishes the personality, while the fellowship with both unites the two in the Godhead. "It is not fellowship with GOD and us, but with us, whose fellowship is with GOD, and the FATHER and the SON. The Blood of JESUS . . . cleanseth us;" being a real present excludes either the Atonement or Holy Baptism; it is objective, and not subjective. "The Blood of CHRIST itself, as the actual objective cause, once for all, of our reconciliation and sanctification . . . whatever sins we may still be betrayed into by the infirmity of our nature and the malice of the devil, from them the Blood of JESUS purifies us day by day." It is needless to observe, while the Dean leaves it indefinite as to how the precious Blood is to be applied, the great Catholic commentators see in it a daily partaking of the Holy Eucharist, a daily application of the Incarnation and Atonement to our ever recurring needs and sins. The schoolmen would see in this use of the present tense a real and physical efficiency. "We have an Advocate with the FATHER, JESUS CHRIST the righteous." There is no discrepancy between this passage and S. John xiv. 16: "He Himself the SON of GOD, being thus asserted to hold this office in the first place, and the HOLY SPIRIT to be His substitute in His absence." There are two points which the Dean has omitted; one, that He Who is an advocate for the Christian will be a judge for the Jew; and also that by the Fathers the word *παράκλητος* is used as common to the whole Trinity. Of GOD the FATHER, says S. Athanasius, by S. Paul, (2 Cor. v. 20,) τοῦ Θεοῦ παρακαλοῦντος δι' ἡμῶν: of GOD the SON, our present passage: of GOD the HOLY GHOST, S. John xiv. 16. On the epithets

πιστὸς and δίκαιος as applied to God (i. 9,) the former, says the Dean, is by almost all commentators referred to God's faithfulness "to His plighted word and promise;" and he rightly adheres to the strict meaning of *just* in the latter. The difficulty is to know "what particular phase of the divine justice is meant." "S. John in his Epistle," says S. Cyprian, "has united both things, both that we ought to offer prayers for our sins, and that pardon is accorded us when we do so. Hence he says that the LORD is faithful to forgive sins, because He keeps there the word of His promise." (De Orat. sec. xv.) The Dean is unwilling to extend the justice of God here to the satisfaction of CHRIST, and so he sums up his interpretation with these words: "God is faithful to His promises; is *just* in His dealing." Yet the notion of the Atonement cannot be excluded even from this definition of God's justice, for He has, as Cajetan well observes, to be *just* towards CHRIST as well as towards us, and every promise is in some sense a debt which it is an act of justice to repay. So in this case; God is faithful towards *man*, and *just* towards *Christ*; because pardon is a debt of justice to CHRIST, Who earned it for us by His own death, to Whom also God promised it.

On the λασμός of ch. ii. 2, the Dean writes: "the word implies that CHRIST has, as our sin-offering, reconciled God and us by *nothing else* but by His voluntary death as a sacrifice." Ven. Bede adds *something else* to this view, rightly coupling the Advocate with the Propitiation. "Qui per *humanitatem* interpellat pro nobis apud Patrem, idem per divinitatem propitiatur nobis cum Patre." It is remarkable that the latter portion of this verse, "not for ours only, but also for the whole world," receives this comment from the Dean. "So Bede, holding that *our* applied to those men living, of the whole world to those that were to come after. But this unworthy and evasive view is exposed by the whole mass of evangelical expositors." Firstly we quote Bede's own words and then see how far they merit the epithets "evasive" and "unworthy." "The LORD is a propitiation not for those alone for whom then living in the flesh John was writing, but also for the whole Church which is diffused through the entire breadth of the world." Perhaps the Dean prefers to hold with Tirinus that our Blessed LORD is a propitiation for infidels; for those who *not* believing on the Son of God have not life, but the wrath of God abiding on them. We should have imagined that Theodore Beza would have been reckoned amongst the number of "Evangelical exponents," yet he applies this expression to the elect, or faithful of all places, times, orders, and ages; confirming this opinion from S. John x. 16, xi. 52, xvii. 20, 21. Estius who is *not* "Evangelical," taking into consideration the preceding verse nobly supports the view of Ven. Bede and Beza, asserting "that it is the propitiation for the sins of those of whom He is the Advocate, yet He is an

Advocate of the elect alone, because for these alone He prays, (S. John xvii. 9.)" The old commandment which is nevertheless new is thus treated by Dean Alford. A logical connection is to be maintained between vv. 6 and 7 and between vv. 8 and 9: "the walk of CHRIST which is our example is essentially and completely summed up in one word, Love; and so the command to walk as He walked essentially and completely resolves itself into a law of brotherly love." The "which ye had from the beginning" is to be referred to the law of the Jewish economy; it "will hardly bear interpreting of the remote forefathers of the readers;" and so the "beginning" must date "from the beginning" of their Christian life; from the time they heard the word. "Then as to *new* and *old*, the explanation will be simple enough. The command to love one another cannot be said to be new, for it forms part of the *word which ye heard*, nay, is the very sum and centre of that *word*: but again, it may be said to be new, inasmuch as it ever assumes new freshness as the Christian life unfolds, as the old darkness is more and more cleared away and the true light shineth: *new*, in that it was first promulgated with Christianity and unknown before." "Which thing is true in you and in Him," &c. "New as regards you, because you are newly come from darkness into light: new as regards Him, because He uttered it when He came into the world to lighten every man," &c. This is precisely the treatment of S. Augustine. "Wherefore did he call that commandment old? 'Which ye had from the beginning,' he says. Behold therefore that it is old, ye have heard it already; in other respects it will be contrary to the LORD when He says, 'A new commandment I give unto you, that ye love one another.' But in what respect was the commandment old? Not because it pertained to the old man. But wherefore? 'Which ye have had from the beginning,' 'which ye have heard from the beginning.' The same commandment the Apostle shows to be true, saying, 'again a new commandment I write unto you.' Not another, but the very same; what I said was old, the same is also new. How? 'Which thing is true in Him and in you.' But how is it new? 'because the darkness is passing away and the true light now shineth.' Behold whence it is new: for darkness belongs to the old man, light truly to the new man. What said the Apostle Paul? 'Put off therefore the old man,' &c., Colos. iii. 9." But neither S. Augustine nor Ven. Bede connects the commandment with the walking after CHRIST. Bede writes: "The same charity is an *old* command, because it was commanded from the beginning; it is a *new* command, because, the darkness being cast out it pours in the desire of a new light . . . darkness pertains to the old man, light truly from the new man." The arguments are certainly very strong which would refer the *ἀπ' ἀρχῆς* back to that eternal law of love which was written by a finger of GOD upon man's nature from the

beginning. S. Augustine and the Ven. Bede confine the commandment to the law of love, while the Dean would absorb into its meaning the sixth verse.

We note a little inaccuracy upon this verse, by the way. We should not have referred to it, had it not related to one who wrought as much mischief in the interpretation of Holy Scripture as confusion in the civil government of the Church. "Luther simply but appositely remarks, that it is not CHRIST's walking on the sea, but His ordinary walk, that we are called on here to imitate." We do not deny that Luther did so remark; all that we assert is, that he borrowed this apposite remark from S. Augustine. "Fortè hoc nos monet, ut ambulemus in mari? Absit. Hoc ergo, ut ambulemus in via justitiæ. In qua via? Jam commemoravi. Fixus in cruce erat et in ipsa via ambulabat: ipsa est via charitatis." If Dean Alford had read S. Augustine's exposition of this epistle, it was hardly fair of him to give Luther the credit for what the Father had written; and if he had not read it, then he is convicted of having made this palpable mistake, not only of studying the modern German commentators in preference to such an interpreter of Holy Scripture as S. Augustine was, but of actually taking Luther, and leaving the great mind of the Western Church. The influence of these same German commentators is seen in the Dean's interpretation of the word "world," in verses 15, 16, 17. He cannot reconcile with a personal world the things in the world, although the neuter plural is referred entirely to personal temptations. Should a material world be understood, then there is a danger of introducing a dualism between God and the world of matter; so the widest signification is accepted—viz., that of "the world as of human persons, including the inferior ranks of created beings, and the mass of inanimate matter which they inhabit." And then is summed up the history of the world and its connection with the fall of Adam, being sometimes personal, sometimes material and local. Even the lusts of men are regarded as lusts of that world in which men are living. "As the world is summed up in man, both those objective material things which are properly *the things in the world*, and those inward subjectivities which are in man, and grounded on his worldly state, are regarded as being *in the world*, and these pass into, and are almost interchanged with, one another." The three things spoken of by S. John, verse 16, "are subjectivities having their ground in the objectivities of the ungodly world." Indeed the lusts of the wicked "are part of, and depend on a world which is passing away." Even Rosenmüller, who in his *Scholia* simply analyses and interprets the Greek text, says that the world here does not signify *created things*; neither customs nor laws instituted by men, but every kind of wickedness of which S. John gives examples, and expresses by "the things that are in the world," which flow from wicked men, from their

evil habits, from their other vices; the world that is passing away, worldly men who perish, with that which also delighted them, which are, as it were, so many dead bodies, and quickly to pass away. The great father and theologian, the Ven. Bede, takes exactly the same view as that which is maintained by the mere scholar. The command of verse 15 is given generally to all the children of the Church—to fathers, to infants, to young men, and the reason of the statement in the same verse, “If any man love the world,” &c., is this—that one heart is not capable of holding two opposite loves, just as no man can serve two masters; so that, as the “love of the FATHER” is the fount and origin of all virtue, so is the love of the world the root and cherisher of all vice. Bede interprets “all that is in the world,” all things which are in the mind of those who inhabit the world, and who love to dwell in the world; the expression being opposed to those who are said to dwell in heaven, by having their conversation in heaven, of whom the heart is raised above, although they walk upon the earth in the flesh. The “all” would show that the lovers of the world have nought except the lust of the flesh, the lust of the eye, and the pride of life, and by these three alone human desire is tempted to its fill. The “of the world” is of the love of the world; although in the world’s passing away he makes an allusion to the day of judgment, and of its change by fire into a better form. It is the lusts thereof of which he chiefly speaks, for which there shall be no further time in which it can work. But he who has performed the will of the LORD shall never have his thoughts perish, and because he desired celestial and eternal things, these desires will remain unchangeable and for ever. Such an one, like Mary, has chosen the good part which shall not be taken away from her. The mixing up of the spiritual and material world is a product of the later development of the Orthodox German School; it received a general recognition in this country from Bishop Ellicott’s profound and thoughtful sermons upon “The Destiny of the Creature,” whose views have been adopted, with hardly any modification, by Dean Alford. It is a notion which has no primitive authority to support it; it could not be gleaned from the pages of any of the great fathers and schoolmen; it was against this notion that Mr. Ashley pleaded in his “Victory of the Spirit,” in which, following the interpretation of Origen, he vindicated the teaching of S. Paul, as contained in the eighth chapter of the Epistle to the Romans from this antipatristic and unauthoritative teaching. It is almost needless to say, after the foregoing remarks, that S. Chrysostom’s κόσμος is entirely subjective, and, as his manner is, he takes advantage of these verses to expatiate upon the meaning of S. Paul’s words, “being rooted and grounded in love,” i.e., upon the love of God as opposed to the love of the world. The Dean well defends the word *Antichrist* against the false meaning of

"substitute for CHRIST," which Grotius would put upon it, instead of its real signification, an enemy to CHRIST. 'Avrì, in composition, says Rosenmüller, indicates one who asserts his equality with another, and who opposes himself to and resists another. "Here it is as *liars* that we hear of them, as deniers of the Truth, which Truth is JESUS CHRIST, the SON of GOD." Bede calls *Antichrists*, not only the heretics who deny the Catholic faith, but those who, confessing it, are opposed to CHRIST by their wicked lives. "Now ought each one," says S. Augustine, "to ask his own conscience—'Am I an Antichrist?'" 1 Cor. xii. 16, is applied by him to this subject. If a man is one with the body of CHRIST, he is no Antichrist, and he cannot go out of that one body; but if he be not one with the body he is an Antichrist. The *χρίσμα* of verse 20, 27, is ingeniously thought by Bengel to be introduced as mere play upon the words *Christos*, *Chrisma*, "from the sound and derivation of the words *Christ* and *Antichrist* which he had just been using." This is as much as to say that the inspiration of God the HOLY GHOST is directed by, and lends itself to, a certain jingling of sounds and words; that the interior message which He delivers is influenced by some passing analogies in the vehicle through which it comes. But if the Dean gives a *portion* of Bengel's note, let him by all means give the rest of it; instead of which we are favoured with a lengthy quotation from Düsterstreck, to prove, from various passages of Holy Scripture, the anointing even of our Blessed LORD, as well as of all members of His Mystical Body, by God the HOLY GHOST; and when we ask what it really is, we find it defined to be a "token that we are in the FATHER and the SON, that we are children of God. The HOLY GHOST teaches the faithful the truth and keeps them in it. This anointing, by virtue of which they are CHRIST's and the FATHER's, and without which a man is none of CHRIST's, in respect of which they are Christs, or anointed ones, the *Antichrists* attack in its very root." We ask, *what* is this token? Dean Alford does not answer this question; Bengel does. It was a portion of the baptismal gift—"Namque cum Baptismo quem susceperent, conjunctum erat donum Spiritus Sancti; cujus significandi causa ex hoc ipso loco deinceps usu receptum esse videtur, ut oleo corpora baptizatorum ungerentur." "Seek, the LORD helping," says the Ven. Bede, "to preserve entire, both in soul and body, the grace of the HOLY SPIRIT which ye received in baptism;" whilst, as a secondary meaning, he gives as an unction, "the love of GOD which is shed abroad upon our hearts by the HOLY GHOST." Lastly, that very difficult passage, verse 6, despite the expression "*ordinance* of baptism" (p. 908) receives a full and Catholic treatment at the Dean's hands. "They represent—the *water*, the baptism of water which the LORD Himself underwent and instituted for His followers; the *blood*, the baptism of blood which He

himself underwent and instituted for His followers. And it is equally impossible to sever from these words the historical accompaniments and associations which arise on their mention." We quite coincide with the opinion, "that *blood* cannot by any means be understood of the LORD's Supper, as has been done by many." Its primary meaning must be the blood of the passion, "which He poured out for us, redeeming us by His passion," according to Bede, who adds, however, "*cujus sacramentis semper refecti nutriemur ad salutem.*"

We need not say here anything upon the Dean's Apocalyptic labours; for an elaborate analysis of his treatment of this most wonderful book was given soon after the publication of the Greek edition of this portion of the New Testament, of which our present volume is but a translation. We have only to refer our readers to a paper entitled "Recent Annotators on the Apocalypse, Wordsworth and Alford," *Ecclesiastic*, vol. xxiii., pp. 193—210, May, 1861, in which they may find some pertinent remarks upon the line of interpretation which is in the main adopted in the work before us. The three notices of this Testament which have appeared in our pages, sufficiently attest the high value which we place upon Dean Alford's labours. We regret that we cannot give them more unmixed praise; but, to tell the truth, if we had designed to be overcritical, there are many minor points in his construing, his treatment of the participles in particular, at which we should take considerable exception. We should dispute with him the principles upon which he has founded his Greek text. We should have rejoiced over a deeper and more spiritual theology; to have found in his commentary less of the mind of man, and more of the mind of God, as expressed in the traditional teaching of the Catholic Church. In this first Epistle of S. John we consider that, with all his modern appliances, and such innumerable sources from whence to draw material of every kind and from every school of learning, for the illustration of the sacred text, he falls far short of the Ven. Bede as a commentator, and infinitely short of S. Augustine, in entering into the mind of S. John; and yet, as we have before stated, the writings of S. John seem to be the especial and beloved study of Dean Alford. This Testament, in both its forms, has done, and is doing a great work in the Church at this time; it might have done a much greater work had its author been content to sacrifice a part of the intended comprehensiveness of its aim, in order to arrive at greater depth in its details. Let his own concluding words be taken as a sample of the spirit and intention with which, for twenty-four years, he has unceasingly laboured upon the New Testament. "May He spare the hand which has been put forward to touch His ark. May He, for CHRIST's sake, forgive all rashness, all perverseness, all uncharitableness, which may be found in this book, and sanctify it to the use of His Church; its

truth, if any, for teaching ; its manifold defects, for warning. My prayer is, and shall be, that in the stir and labour of men over His Word, in which these volumes have been an humble contribution, others may arise and teach, whose labours shall be so far better than mine, that this book, and its writer, may, ere long, be entirely forgotten."

A FEW WORDS ON THE INCREASE OF THE EPISCOPATE AND THE DISTRIBUTION OF PATRONAGE.

(Communicated.)

(Continued from p. 311.)

BUT it may be argued, that, however beneficial such a plan might be, it will not secure to us all that we have a right to ask, inasmuch as there is no provision here for the promotion of deserving clergymen, otherwise than to the highest offices of the Church ; and that, so far as we have yet gone, there has been nothing done for the most ill-used of the whole body, those who have been curates for years, and have little or no prospect of advancement. But we have only to carry out the principle here introduced to its full extent, in order to open the doors of preferment to these ; and as soon as this shall have been done, not the mere benefice that many of them would jump at now, will be obtainable, but the approach also to the highest offices of the Church. The clergy and laity would then take care of those who at present are completely shut out from all chance ; and some of these would, no doubt, mount up to the representative bishoprics, and, perhaps, to the higher sees, after they should have made themselves known by their merits ; without the temptation to resort to indirect means for promotion. At all events it will be better for the Church when men seek for promotion by popularity rather than, as often happens now, by means essentially wrong.

We would, then, take the whole of the public patronage below the dignity of canon, (whether it be exercised at present by the Crown, or its ministers, the Prince of Wales, the archbishops and bishops, or ecclesiastical corporations, aggregate or sole,) and throw it into one lot ; apportioning to each diocese the whole of the livings that are situate within its boundaries, to be afterwards dispensed in three equal portions by the bishop, the clergy, and the laity, or rather such of the last-mentioned body as had communicated three times during the last twelve months. There were in 1832 (exclusive of the patronage of the dean and canons of Christ

Church, Oxford, whose benefices are attached to the foundation of their college,) 4,748 such benefices; and the alterations that have since been made have probably resulted in a considerable increase of this number, so as that there would be a large amount of livings thrown open were this plan to be adopted; and this too, notwithstanding that the Lord Chancellor is selling part of his patronage, and so a portion will be diverted into other channels. And the only qualification we should require would be that candidates for preferment should have served three consecutive years in the diocese, and be still serving in it, without regard to the nature of their office; so that curates, lecturers, minor canons, chaplains of prisons and infirmaries, and union chaplains, should be upon the like basis as to eligibility, as their more favoured brethren; and no man who had served in any public capacity for the given period should be shut out from a chance.

We would have for instance, on the introduction of the plan into any diocese, a dozen clergymen selected; four by the bishop, four by the clergy, and four by the qualified laity of the diocese. These twelve clergymen should stand first for preferment in it; presenting themselves in such a manner to the benefices to be bestowed, that no two members of one section of the nominees should succeed to incumbencies without the interposition of one nominee from each of the other sections, unless from the refusal of the persons next in rotation to accept the preferment to be bestowed. We would have the names in each section arranged according to their seniority in the diocese, and no others nominated until all of the twelve had been provided for; making an exception only on account of the refusal of all to accept the benefices falling vacant, and supplementing their number then on a similar plan.

In this way the counter influences would operate more powerfully even than in the case of the appointment of bishops, and men would have a chance who now never get it. Indeed every one would have three chances to one as at present, (or in truth the merest fraction of one,) and nepotism and all that sort of thing would go down. The bishop would not like to be cut out in the case of his patronage by the clergy and laity; the clergy by the bishop and laity; or the laity by the bishop and clergy. We should have plenty of pokers for the ecclesiastical fire, and the scene would be more cheerful than at present, when the outer darkness is too often symbolized by the "cold shade" in which very many of the worthiest men are allowed to languish, and the "weeping and gnashing of teeth" are painfully realised. We would bridge over the gulf between Dives and Lazarus; and this too without breaking in upon the comfort or dignity of the former, though we would by no means have it thought that Lazarus is always to suffer from wounds, or is only to be fed from the crumbs that fall from the rich man's table.

There would be no difficulty as to the election of nominees by the clergy, for the course to be pursued would be similar to that recommended for the election of bishops: and it need not be imagined that there would be any difficulty in the conducting of the elections among the laity. For just as in the other cases, through the means of the rural deans and the archdeacon, the elections were found to be facilitated, though the electors were broken up into sections, and spread over a large surface; so a like issue might be secured in the case of the electoral functions of the laity, through the aid of the archdeacon, rural deans, and churchwardens. For these last-mentioned officers would only have to get from the officiating clergyman a list of the communicants, and then summon them to a meeting to elect a person to be returned as their nominee to the rural dean, (should any one desire to nominate any one,) or in the opposite case to certify him of the fact; and to re-assemble them again (on the receipt of a list from him of the persons nominated by the laity throughout the deanery,) to arrange them according to their preference, as in the case of the election of bishops by the clergy. After this should have been done, a fresh return to the rural dean would enable him to get at the names of the persons who had the greatest number of votes in the deanery, so as to return them to the archdeacon to be placed upon a list to be made up from this and similar returns from the other rural deaneries. And then the archdeacon's list could be sent to the churchwardens in every parish, to be submitted for arrangement according to preference, to the electors within their boundaries; and when he should have received all their returns, he would readily get at the names that had the greatest number of votes, and submit the number required to the bishop, to be placed upon the list out of which the new incumbents would be selected.

It is very probable that many persons will stigmatise these recommendations as uncalled for, if not revolutionary; from a supposed tendency in them to decrease the influence of the Crown and its ministers, and to deprive the bishops of the power that they should hold, as well as of that which all would agree should be taken from them. But the Crown and its officers lose no *prestige* by not interfering with the army and the appointments in the law, and there is no reason why they should incur such a loss by a more restricted use of patronage in the Church. And the bishops, certainly, will be gainers by the scheme, for they will have more to give away, in the manner that has been recommended than they had before, and what they will have to dispense will fall to them more frequently. For when they are tied to certain preferments, they may pass through their whole incumbency without coming to a turn; but when they share in whatever may come, (from public sources at least,) this cannot possibly happen; for out of some five thousand cases there will always be deaths and removals oc-

curing, and of the benefices thus vacated they will of course claim their thirds.

The report of the Commissioners of Inquiry into Ecclesiastical Revenues made the number of benefices in the gift of the archbishops and bishops to be 1248, and the whole number of public benefices (*minus* those that belong to the dean and chapter of Christ Church, Oxford) to be 4748. But there were not only some benefices in which the patronage was not returned, of which some may be to be added to this number; but there have been several new benefices created since 1832, which would certainly increase it. If, however, there were only 4748 as then, the share of the bishops would be 1582 and a fraction, against 1248, so that they could not be injured by our recommendations.

But even were this not the case, as it most certainly is, some such scheme as that we have been recommending would present to our view an opportunity of compromise between our present system and the extreme probable demand. For some will be found to declare that our recommendations do not go far enough; for there is an opinion maintained by many that without the consent of the laity no one should be fixed in any incumbency whatever. When, however, it comes to be recollected that in 1832 there were no less than 5,096 benefices in private patronage and 364 others in *quasi* private patronage, and that Lord Westbury's scheme will add 327 to this number; and that the exercise by the laity of a veto upon the nomination of the possessors of this right would amount to a suspension of it; it will at once be seen that such an infraction upon their privilege could not be tolerated. For though it may be alleged that it is a limited right only that is possessed by these persons, the examination of the qualification of their nominees (if there be any at all) resting only with the bishop; and as even he is not at liberty to reject any, but under the supervision of the law (which has already shown itself to be extremely jealous of the manner in which this power is exercised) it cannot be supposed that less qualified critics should step in and put an end to the right of the owners of patronage, without a murmur being raised. If bishops who must be supposed to be able to express an opinion, and who even though they should act erroneously, will at least act conscientiously, find it almost impossible to interfere, except in extreme cases; Brown, Jones, and Robinson cannot be allowed to exercise expurgatory powers. And if this be an impossibility in 5,000 cases, it is in 10,000: there can be no difference made between public and private patronage as to the admission of nominees to incumbencies; and so any scheme founded on this principle must drop.

But not only would there be this difficulty (which appears to us to be insurmountable) to contend with, but there is another which would be held to be fatal to it by all who have any experience in

the election of incumbents by their parishioners ; and that is to be seen in the heart-burning among the electors, and sometimes litigation, and the ruin of the influence of the successful candidate, which arises out of these. This is the case not unfrequently when the right of election is vested in trustees, and part only of the parish has anything to do with it ; and takes place, almost of a certainty, in every instance in which the parish at large is concerned ; and this, assuredly, ought to forbid the general adoption of such a plan. No one knows the truth of these remarks more than those earnest Churchmen who have lamented it in their own parishes ; and no one would hail its perpetuation with greater sorrow than they. It may not, however, be that so sad a blow should be inflicted upon the Church without the deprecation of all good men ; and it need not be longer dwelt upon by us. There is, however, another matter that must be recollected, and that is the injury that would be inflicted by such an arrangement on the character of the clergy, who would fall under the suspicion, and sometimes into the perpetration, of dishonourable practices, in order to gain their ends, and adapt their preaching more to the caprices of their hearers than to *Regula Fidei*, and so defeat the object aimed at by the endowment of their churches, which was the maintenance of their independence as teachers of men, who shall hereafter have to give an account of their whole lives, by the withdrawal of them from the necessity of looking to the mere wills of their hearers.

But any one must see that the necessity of any such interference as this could not any longer be set up, when the scheme that we have offered should have been adopted. For the great alteration that would ensue in the disposal of patronage, by the opening up of some 5,000 livings to the access of the whole clergy, would operate much more powerfully in their favour than any such method could do ; and it would be but a poor exchange to barter away its solid advantages, for the mere shadow of an easement, which would not only be not effectual, but attended by evils that no energy in the after life of the successful candidate could remove. It is not, therefore, for us to look upon it with complacency, or hail it with pleasure, should it be advanced. Our business is first to look to the welfare of the Church generally, and then to the advantage of those that are willing to serve in it ; and as in this case we can have no doubt that the scheme would be bad for both, we are led, notwithstanding its popularity with many, to condemn it altogether as one that cannot be consistently supported by us.

From the plan that has been submitted to our readers no danger of the sort that has been pointed to is to be apprehended ; for although the fortunate candidates for preferment, who may not have been promoted by their bishop, will have depended upon the clergy of the diocese, or the laity within its limits, as the case may

re, the election will have been spread over too large a surface, and influenced by too many people, with whom they will afterwards have little enough to do, to allow of any inconvenience arising. No doubt persons desirous of being thus situated will be glad of the good-will of their parishioners, as it will operate as a recommendation to them; but as they will have to produce an effect upon the whole of the clergy or laity of the diocese, they will try to conciliate *all* their parishioners, and not some only; for a mere sectional recommendation would avail them but little. At all events their election will remove them from the sphere in which they have served to some higher one, and in the great majority of cases to other cures, so as that they could hardly prostitute their office in any such way as that which has been spoken of.

Were the laity only concerned with the elections that have been recommended, it might indeed be possible that in times of an almost universal prejudice a tinge might be given to the teaching of the clergy, who might hope for preferment at their hands, even though it might be to a distant place that they should be removed on their success. But we not only do not find a universal agreement upon religion, so as that the opportunity of this would be wanting; but there are two other sources of preferment as well, and it is not likely that the candidates for elevation would forget that they would lose *prestige* in these directions if they were to allow themselves to be corrupted in the manner alluded to. The real policy would be to get the greatest support from the greatest number; and no man, who knew what he was about, would so far throw himself into the hands of the laity as to lose the countenance of the bishop and clergy, or so far commit himself to the other two orders, as to render himself obnoxious to their rivals. He would find himself obliged to squeeze the hands of all; and this would be to the benefit of the Church, which is torn to pieces now, not because men do not court any, but because they do not court enough, in their extreme faithfulness to the head of the "ism" of their choice. We need a little wantonness to save us—a little leaning to the right hand and to the left—a little going out of the path. God must be sought wherever He is to be found; and He will be found everywhere if we will look for Him. There is no class too bad for that. For even with the lost He is present to save, to forgive, to turn, to lead into the way of righteousness; to refresh, to strengthen, to sanctify, until that state shall be acquired in which there shall be no more sorrow and no more sin, and no more diversity of opinion, which is in itself the source of much sin. And just as this is the case with men individually, in the matter of their salvation, it would be with the Church and the pursuit of preferment in it under our scheme; for there would be scarce a quarter in which an opening to it would not be to be found. Though there be parties that one does not like

and cannot like, it would be necessary to conciliate even them; men could not afford to despise any. There would be something in the bishop, the clergy, and the people, that would make itself felt, and which would do away with our mutual antipathies, and make us feel that we are all men of the same flesh and blood and the same family, and must be at peace with all. But even were it not so, high character is just as much valued by the laity as by the clergy, where a sufficient number is brought in to keep indirect influence at bay; and the man who would carry everything before him in the back parlour of the Red Lion at Little Diddleton, would find himself in a very different situation when the laity on its five or six hundred acres came to be mixed up with the phalanx that would be presented by half a million. It would, however, be an insult to our readers to resort to any further argument upon this point; and so we will turn now to the exercise of patronage by private owners, upon which something must be said, although it is obviously less capable of satisfactory treatment than any other.

Lord Westbury's act for the disposal of the minor patronage of the Lord Chancellor was founded upon the principle of augmentation, and introduced with a flourish of trumpets as to the advantage to be derived to the Church by the placing of the livings referred to in the hands of private owners; and this may seem to convey with it an almost total exculpation of these parties. But we all know well enough, that if things are to be sold there must be buyers, and as bishops were not likely to invest their money in the purchase of commodities out of which they could derive no advantage, or other corporations ecclesiastical, whether aggregate or sole; and as other government functionaries could gain nothing by taking up what the chancellor might think proper to lay down, and municipal corporations are not allowed to possess this kind of property, it is difficult to conceive who could speculate in it but private owners, or joint-stock companies, who might have an itching to establish some particular heresy. We are not bound, therefore, to take the laudation of the private owners at more than its worth, or to look upon them as altogether immaculate, though we can see the wisdom of Lord Westbury's preference of them to the last-mentioned parties, as there is certainly less evil to be apprehended from those than from these. We would, however, say that it is not only extremely difficult to deal with the patronage of the private owners (as indeed we have already hinted,) but that it might be as well to be less stringent in our exactions from them, at any rate for a time, and to trust to the elevating effect of the alterations in the arrangements as to public patronage, to produce a greater agreement between the discharge of their functions and the requirements of the Church and also of the public; for the people generally have an interest in the well-working of our ecclesiastical system, whether they belong to the

Church or not, and cannot be wholly excluded from our thoughts in the discussion of this matter.

With regard then to this kind of patronage we should say, that *at present* we should require only a longer preparatory service from the parties to be nominated under it, and testimonials of a more effectual nature. We would render it obligatory on the nominees of private owners of patronage to have served, within the boundaries of the diocese in which they are to be preferred, in the office of curate, or in some other public ecclesiastical office, *for four years* previous to their admission to incumbencies in private gift, and to be still serving in it, or to have served *for six years* in some other diocese, and still to be serving in it; and we would have their testimonials go to the proof of their possession of fair average ability for the performance of the duties of a parish priest, as well as their possession of moral worth and freedom from heretical opinions. We make the distinction we have recommended between service in the diocese they are to be preferred in, and service in other dioceses, upon the conviction that it is desirable that they should if possible be connected with the diocese in which they are ultimately to be fixed; not only because they will be more likely to be known, (which is a security in itself,) but because upon their admission into it they will begin to qualify for preferment in public gift: and some concession ought to be made to the other clergy within its limits, who are wholly excluded from any share in private preferment, and who must feel less repugnance at advancement of men of their own number, than that total strangers should be put over their heads, though it be true that they do not come *ex partibus infidelium*. There would be no great difficulty in getting curacies for young men of worth in their own immediate neighbourhood, and the distinction made will operate as a *premium* on the attempt, and hence it is that we recommend it.

Happy will it be for the owners of private patronage if they can get off on these terms, and still happier for the Church if they take the opportunity that will then be afforded to them to reform. For if they will go on presenting men who have no other claim to the possession of their benefices than their relationships to their patrons, they may rest assured that a change will be brought about which they will not like. Men should be able to read, and to make themselves heard, and, *if it be possible*, also make themselves understood by those whom they have to teach; and it would be desirable also that they should know how to treat their parishioners. For however much these last may be looked upon by their patrons as parts of their estates, and be dealt with by others as if they were no better than this, it will not do for the rector, or other clergyman, to look upon them in such a light, or let them suspect that he does. There must be something more of a genuine Christian feeling for them; and this cannot be said to be universally the case

at present. Men think of their high birth, and of their long expectancy of their preferment, and the best way of turning it to their advantage in a pecuniary point of view when they have got it, and as conferring a *status* in society, more than of their work with the poor, and that spiritual intercourse which they should hold with them, and indeed with the rest of the people that are committed to them. But this will not do, and is found not to do even by themselves, when chance leads them to spheres which are not under the immediate influence of their friends.

We would cite an instance with which we are familiar, in which a most estimable clergyman came to grief through the indiscretion which resulted from the too favourable position in which he had been placed by his birth and connection with a large landowner. He had been curate in this gentleman's parish, and of course carried everything before him; but he chanced to be preferred to a distant parish, in which he had to work as others very commonly do, through his own unassisted efforts. He was blessed with a well-furnished pocket, and a disposition to spend his money very freely on the poor, and he was as indefatigable in his school as he was liberal to his parishioners. But though lookers-on could not but admit that he had done more good than any other clergyman that had ever been known in the locality in which he was fixed, he could not get on as well as his predecessors did. There was too much of the *sic volo, sic jubeo, stet pro ratione voluntas* about him; and this altogether marred what he did, and brought down upon him the hatred and persecution of his parishioners. Nay, the very persons whom he was feeding, clothing, and keeping, though doubtless civil enough to his face, made no scruple of joining in the general outcry against him, when speaking to others whom they could trust.

Now if such things could happen to one, who was to our own knowledge to be commended above almost all others for what he did, and indeed for everything but for a manner contracted in an unfavourable school, what must be the issue in such cases as present no one redeeming feature about them? What can be said of those of this class who never visit the sick, who never look to the wants of the poor, who never interest themselves about the teaching of the young, who discharge the duties they do trouble themselves with perfunctorily, and who seem bent upon shooting, hunting, cricket, or croquet, rather than study, and whose great wish is to shine as little squires rather than as clergymen? Not but what others than squires' sons do sometimes thus miscarry. But while it is no wonder that this should be the case, as bad examples find more ready followers than good; and it would be strange if the six thousand instances in which this is the normal state, should not create mischief also amongst those in which it is altogether abnormal; it is from them that the mischief comes,

and therefore upon them must the responsibility lie. We cannot expect so prevalent a practice to be without its effect upon the Church at large; but then it is impossible that we should not speak of it, or that we should not call attention to it, as amongst the things most strongly to be denounced.

The laity, however, whether of the nobility or gentry; our bankers; our merchants; and even associations that have been formed for the pursuit of mercantile objects, are busying themselves much more than formerly, in the building and endowment of churches, the building and support of schools, and the promotion of the general welfare of their poorer brethren; and this to such an extent as to justify the declaration that the Church is shaking off that lethargy by which it has been so long oppressed. Clergymen have not now to complain of want of help, or of apathy, about the state of the poor; and as this is the case, we may hope that the *squiro-mania* of the clergy will go down, and that their energies will be directed to the promotion of those things which become them as parish priests, rather than as country gentlemen. For though there may be no great harm in all rural sports, or in spending a few hours at dinner or evening parties, there is so much for them to do that is entirely of an opposite character, that they cannot be entirely free from blame, who allow their thoughts to be turned out of their natural channel; and they must be entirely condemned who make them the characteristics of their lives, and allow them to exclude all else, which can be rather than ought to be avoided.

We do not wish to set people against the sons of the nobility, or of the country gentlemen; all we want is to get rid of those matters which are accidentally mixed up with the lives of too many of our clergy, and which make them repulsive to others. Nor, indeed, in anything that we have said has there been anything of a sinister nature; all that we have aimed at is to make the service of God, on the part of those whose chief business it is to promote it, more like what it should be, by the removal from amongst us, as far as is practicable, of abuses in patronage, and to give to those who are to be guided by them a better chance, through the encouragement of merit in our clergy. For the endowments of our churches were not given, in order that such as possess them should live with the rich or the great, or that they should be enabled in any way to lord it over God's heritage; neither were they intended to be made subordinate to the promotion of the ends of any one of the many classes into which the Church may be divided, but to enable those who should fill its offices to do their duty to all, without distinction, in the great work that is laid upon them of forwarding the salvation of souls, as God may enable them to do it, and therefore in perfect independence of men.

We want no alterations made for the mere sake of change, and

in that which we have aimed at, we have not dreamed of the exclusion of any. We would give to all that desire to serve God in the offices of the Church, the opportunity of doing so, and weed out only from the ministry such as will not do this. And if in making our recommendations we have shown a determination to respect the person of no man, it has been in the hope that greater glory may be given to God, through the bringing of our Ecclesiastical system into much better working order, and not for the heaping of contumely on the heads of any.

THE POSITION OF THE IRISH CHURCH.

Essays on the Irish Church. By Clergymen of the Established Church in Ireland. Oxford and London: Parker; Dublin: Hodges.

THE Irish Church has received another warning to set her house in order, for the object of Sir John Gray's resolution in the House of Commons cannot be mistaken. It is no less than the confiscation of the property now held by the Irish Church, and the announcement made by the chief Secretary for Ireland, on behalf of the late Government, that they would be ready to entertain the question as soon as public opinion was sufficiently ripe to justify such a step, shows what manner of protection may be expected from a Whig Government. Although the ministry has changed since then, and the contest may be postponed for a little time, we must not lay down our arms, for the attack may be renewed at any moment.

As the appeal has been made to public opinion we must not shrink from a discussion of the real position of the Irish Church, and of the title by which she holds her property, in a fair and candid spirit. For various reasons a prejudice exists amongst some English Churchmen against the Irish Church, and this prejudice we must ask our readers to lay aside for a little while. We do not say that the prejudice is undeserved. There seems to be an unquiet spirit which possesses a large number of the Irish clergy, and instead of doing their work quietly at home, they come to England with a special mission to denounce, not only the Pope, but all catholic doctrine and ritual; and if we look at the Irishman at home, the picture is not generally a pleasing one. Meagre and slovenly services and controversial Protestant sermons contrast disagreeably with the advance which England has made during the last thirty years in decency of ritual and earnestness of teaching.

This is all very true. The state of the Irish Church may be as bad as it can be, but still we must remember that the condition of the English Church was no better at the commencement of the present century. When she failed to do her work of evangelizing the people she may have deserved that her endowments should be handed over to the Methodists; but yet we may be thankful that God dealt with her in mercy, and not according to her merits. The remembrance of this should at least teach us forbearance towards the Irish Church, which after all, perhaps, shows more life and zeal than her English sister did a few years ago. But we must claim for her sympathy as well as forbearance, and this can scarcely be withheld when we call to remembrance the history of our own revival, for it was the wrongs of the Church of Ireland, when ten of her bishoprics were suppressed, which first led thinking men to consider what would be the position of the Church of England if the State should deal with her as she had done with the Irish Church. Since then we have learnt to believe in the Church not as a mere State machine, as was the common habit formerly, but as a divine institution founded by CHRIST Himself, and the spiritual mother of His people. We have been examining her title-deeds, and have discovered that her connection with the State is but an accident which is in no way essential to her existence. We claim our endowments, not because we are a State Church, but because we are the ancient ecclesiastical corporation to which these endowments were originally granted. We claim the protection of the State, not because our clergy are moral policemen appointed by the Government, but because it is the duty of the State to protect the property of all her subjects. And since we have learnt this lesson, a revival of religious earnestness has followed. We depend not on the State, but on CHRIST, and the blessing of them that rest on no other foundation has fallen upon us. Romanists and Dissenters may taunt us with being a State Church, but we repudiate the charge. And the same claim which we make for ourselves we make for the Church of Ireland. We assert, as in duty bound, her right to her endowments, not because she is the Establishment of the country, but because she is the ancient Church to whom the endowments were originally granted. The attack upon the Irish Church is but the precursor of one which sooner or later will be made on the English Church, and therefore if we suffer the confiscation of Irish Church property, we must be prepared to see the tide of spoliation roll back on our shores. There is scarcely a plea which can be urged against the Irish Church which may not at some time or in some place or other be used against ourselves, and therefore the contest is one in which we are deeply interested, and from which we may not stand aloof.

From opposite sides of the channel which divides the sister kingdoms, Archdeacon Wordsworth and Dr. Alfred Lee have

already raised their voices in defence of the Irish Church. Her mutual relations with the English Church was a subject of discussion at the Bristol Church congress, which proved second in interest to few others; and now the demand of the public for information on the subject is supplied by the valuable essays which we have under review. The authors, Messrs. Byrne, Edwards, Anderson, and Lee, are all clergymen of the *Established Church in Ireland*, as they term it. We should prefer to call it the *Church of Ireland*, and we think that by adopting this designation they would strengthen their cause.

Of the five Essays included in this volume, Mr. Byrne contributes two; the first, on "the general principles of the Establishment and endowment of religious bodies by the State, with special reference to Ireland," and the fifth, "on the influences exerted on Ireland by the Irish Church Establishment." We do not deny that these are able Essays, but we cannot but think that the book would have been better without them. What an establishment exactly means we have never ourselves been able to discover, and since the Irish Church is in a minority, and the fact of a Church which does not obtain the obedience of the entire people being "*the Establishment*," is the gist of all agitation against both the Irish and English Churches, we think it would have been well to have said less about the prestige of an Establishment, and to have rested the claims of the Irish Church exclusively on her historical position.

Certainly Mr. Byrne argues well that it is the duty of the civil power to provide for the universality and permanence of the beneficial influences of religion throughout the nation, and so to make its provisions that the highest amount of benefit may be received. We doubt, however, whether the Irish Church has been so used. The weakness of the Church of Ireland has arisen from the State having made her an instrument, not for advancing religion, but for destroying the national characteristics of the Irish people; and in this she has signally failed. The Irish Church has been the Church which comprised within its fold most of the intellect and wealth of Ireland, and by her influence these classes have been raised in the scale of civilization; but then this influence was impeded in its downward course by the interference of the State. The Irish Church did not descend to the people to raise them up to a higher state of civilization, but spoke from a distance exhorting them to adopt English habits and modes of thought, from which their national independence shrank. This had been the case as well before the Reformation as since. In civilization England had always been in advance of Ireland. From the conquest of Ireland up to recent times the same policy has been adopted. All along the aim of the State has been to assimilate Irish to English customs. The pale was a miniature England which was to extend

its influence throughout the country, but this object was never wholly accomplished. Within the pale the Church was united with the Church of England, and by reason of this union, placed in subjection to the Roman see; but beyond the pale the ancient independence of the Irish Church still lingered, or died out very gradually, and the people were jealous of submission to Rome, because it involved the merging of their own nationality with that of England; but after the Reformation, when the tactics of the State were changed, the Irish people were suspicious of the principles of the Reformation for the very same reason as they had been jealous of the dominance of Rome before. Still the State adhered to its old mistake, and used the Irish Church as a means of Anglicizing the Irish people. English-speaking priests were preferred to Irish, and Englishmen were appointed to Irish sees. No attempt was made to give the Irish people the Holy Scriptures or the Prayer Book in the only language which they understood. The State would only have them taught in a language which they could not or would not learn, whilst the Irish peasantry clung with all the greater tenacity to their native language and their national customs. Hence arose a golden opportunity for the introduction of Papal influence which the Pope did not fail to seize. The missionary priests and bishops which were imported from the Continent did just what the Irish Church ought to have done. They identified themselves with the people, preached and conversed with them in their own language, and made use of their prejudices to obtain influence over them. The weapon which had been thrown away by the Church, acting under the direction of the State, was eagerly seized and used against both Church and State. The Romish priests were easily accessible to Spanish as well as to Italian influence, and this was exercised in stirring up sedition and aggravating Irish jealousy of the English rule. The dislike of the Establishment was a legacy inherited from before the Reformation, but it now gained strength from the influence of the Romish clergy. The penal laws and all the devices which the English government used to oppress the Roman communion in Ireland only tended to increase its influence; and if ever the Irish Church is to exercise her proper functions towards the peasantry, it will be when she has unlearned her establishmentarian traditions and thoroughly identifies herself with the interests of the people.

But in order to do this it is not necessary that the Irish Church should cease to be the established religion of the country, or that she should resign her endowments or her tithes. The demand that she should be deprived of them only shows either an entire ignorance of her history, or else it is the commencement of a crusade which will ultimately fall on all religious endowments in their turn. The assertion that the Irish Church endowments were transferred to her from the Roman Church at the time of the Reformation is

simply an untruth, since the Roman Episcopacy now existing in Ireland has no claim to be a succession from the ancient Irish bishops. It was a foreign importation which had its origin in the reign of Elizabeth, and even if it had not been a fruitful parent of sedition, would have no claim to be invested with the endowments of the ancient Irish Church.

To understand rightly the position of the Irish Church it is necessary to consider three phases of her existence, her ancient, mediæval, and modern history. The first includes the period from the introduction of Christianity to the English invasion by Henry II. : the second extends from the English conquest to the Reformation, the point at which the third begins.

Anciently the Irish Church was as independent as the British. Whether it be true or not that S. Patrick received a commission from Pope Celestine, it is certain that the policy adopted by him in his missionary operations considerably differed from the Church polity of Rome. Two tracts written by S. Patrick are extant, his Confession and his Epistle to Coroticus, in both of which he rests the authority of his mission upon direct revelation from God, an assertion which Mr. Edwards, in his very able historical sketch, considers irreconcilable with such a formal and ostensible commission as later writers represent him to have received from Celestine. Whilst the distinction of order was carefully maintained, there was no regular diocesan episcopacy established. The clergy were united in quasi-monastic communities, and the episcopal dignity was conferred, apparently as a recognition of superior learning and sanctity, sometimes on an inmate of a monastery who lived in obedience to his abbot, sometimes on the chief pastor of a particular clan, and sometimes on the head of a school of learning, or a missionary to the still heathen nations of continental Europe. It is well known that the British and Irish Churches adhered to the eastern custom with regard to the observance of Easter and the tonsure, and when the British Church submitted to the Roman rule at the synod of Whitby, the Irish Church still retained her ancient custom, alleging the authority of S. Columba.

Although the Anglo-Saxon Church now conformed to this and other regulations of the Roman see, the Irish Church was still regarded with affection and respect. Bede, in spite of his Roman predilections, speaks of Ireland as a place resorted to for the study of Holy Scripture, which proves that in spite of her independence, her schools of theology were still renowned throughout the Christian world. The Anglo-Saxon Church retained some peculiarities, and was not brought into entire obedience to the Roman see until the Norman invasion. The semi-independence of the Anglo-Saxon Church was naturally regarded with jealousy by Hildebrand, who gave to William a consecrated banner and a ring when he went forth armed with a papal bull, not only to win a kingdom for

himself, but also to reduce the Church of the Anglo-Saxons to the perfect obedience and order of the holy see. The same reason induced Adrian IV. to make a grant of Ireland to Henry II. of England in 1155. Before this some efforts had been made to reduce Ireland to obedience to Rome. Gillebert, Bishop of Limerick, at the instigation of Anselm, had first taught the doctrine of the papal supremacy, in which he thought he had found a remedy for the evils which were incidental to the isolated position of Ireland. As a reward for this he was appointed papal legate, in which capacity he held a synod at Rathbreasil in 1118. The pallium was first received at the synod of Kells in 1152, when Dublin and Tuam were erected into archbishoprics, but several bishops and clergy refused to be present, regarding the legatine summons as an innovation. In 1171 the invasion of Ireland by Henry II. was accomplished, and one of the first cares of the conqueror was to obtain the submission of the Irish Church to Rome. A council was summoned at Cashel, at which it was enacted that all things should in future in all parts of Ireland be regulated after the model of Holy Church, *and according to the observances of the Anglican Church*. Thus the last remnants of the peculiarities of the Irish Church were abolished, and Ireland submitted to Rome, not because she recognised the papal supremacy as a thing of Divine right, but because she united her Church with the Church of England.

The Canons of this Synod, and no Act of Parliament passed at the time of the Reformation, was the commencement of that bond, which has united the two Churches in that which each now calls the United Church of England and Ireland. For 800 years this union has existed, and in these days of division it would be an act of cowardice and injustice to refuse our sympathy and protection to a sister Church which for so long a time has regarded us as her stronger sister and instructress.

At the Reformation the abolition of the Papal power in England by the united action of the temporal and spiritual powers was speedily followed in Ireland. In 1537 the Irish Parliament declared the King supreme head of the Church in Ireland, prohibited appeals to Rome and Peter's pence, and also suppressed the Papal jurisdiction in that country. Cromer, the Primate, opposed these enactments, but Brown, Archbishop of Dublin, and other prelates supported them. The clergy took the oaths of royal supremacy on the same principle as at the Synod of Cashel they had yielded subjection to the English Church and through her to the Pope.

In the reign of Edward VI., when the Reformation was carried further in England, and a reformed Prayer Book adopted, opinions in Ireland seem to have been divided. Some Prelates refused to adopt the English ritual, while others approved it, and admitted it.

into their dioceses. Up to 1550 the English Government appear to have shown great indulgence to the Irish Church, since the crown occasionally admitted to the possession of their temporalities Bishops who had been provided with Irish sees at Rome. Amongst these were Owen Magenis, Bishop of Down and Connor, Roland de Burgo, Bishop of Clonfort, Hugh Ocervelan, Bishop of Clogher, and Arthur Magenise, who all submitted to the Royal power.

When the tide of Reformation turned in the reign of Mary, Dowdal the Primate, acting under a royal commission, deprived and expelled from their sees the Archbishop of Dublin and four other Bishops who were considered favourable to the principles of the Reformation. These were uncanonically deprived, as it was the individual act of the Primate without the concurrence of his suffragans, and the authority which he asserted was not that which he might have claimed as metropolitan, but simply the power which was conferred on him by a royal commission. Six Bishops were intruded into sees which were not canonically vacant.

The progress of the Reformation in the reign of Elizabeth is that chapter in the history of the Irish Church respecting which much misunderstanding has to be dispelled. There was no convocation of the clergy as yet known to the constitution of the Irish Church, and that which had been done in England by the joint action of Parliament and Convocation, was effected in Ireland by the Parliament alone; but at this time the bishops formed the majority of the peers, so that without the assent of the spirituality no measures of Reformation could have been agreed on. In 1560 the Earl of Sussex was sent by the Queen to promote the adoption of those measures of Reform which had been received in the English Church. In the Irish Parliament which met and enacted these regulations, nineteen prelates were present, of whom two only were opposed. There were not at this time more than twenty-six bishops, and probably not so many, living in Ireland. Consequently the ecclesiastical system of Elizabeth was accepted by a majority of the Irish Bishops. Much has been said about the expulsion of the non-conforming Bishops, and very small is the case which the enemies of the Irish Church can make out. Whilst four Bishops had been irregularly expelled by Dowdal in Mary's reign, two only were deprived in the reign of Elizabeth, and these two had been uncanonically intruded into sees which were not vacant, and whose legitimate pastors were still living. The remainder of the Irish Bishops kept possession of their sees, and thus proved their acceptance of the Reformation,—whilst for twelve years the laity continued to attend the parish churches in which the English Prayer Book was in use.

It was not, however, to be expected that the Court of Rome would permit without a struggle the Irish Church to resume her ancient independence, for in her eyes those who cast off the

supremacy of the Pope had relapsed into heathenism. A mission to Ireland was therefore the natural consequence of the acceptance of the Reformation by the Irish Bishops. There were no Bishops there whose instrumentality she could use, and therefore it was needful to commence a new succession. In 1563 we find three Bishops assuming Irish titles present at the Council of Trent, but they had no previous connection with Ireland, having lately been consecrated at Rome to titular bishoprics. One of them soon afterwards went to Ireland and used the political disaffection which he found prevalent there as the means of stirring up a schism. To keep this schism alive was the interest of Spain, who in her turn used the Roman missionaries as political agents. They found it easy to stir up the feelings of the Irish against the English, and to teach them to hate the Reformation on account of its English origin. Such was the real commencement of the Roman communion which at present exists in Ireland, and which was long identified with sedition and disloyalty. Times have changed, and we would not for a moment charge the Roman Clergy in Ireland now with disloyalty. We would fain believe that the spiritual interests of the people alone actuate their zeal, but we cannot shut our eyes to their past history and the origin of the schism, for they are no more successors of S. Patrick than Bishop Gobat is successor of S. James. The succession of Bishops was unbroken at the Reformation, and therefore the endowments which they possessed before, they might rightfully claim afterwards.

We are not concerned to defend all the acts by which the Reformation was brought about. We have never done so in the case of England; but, nevertheless, we accept the Reformation as a fact. So in Ireland, whilst we may censure the conduct of the Government and have little sympathy with time-serving Bishops, who kept their sees like the vicar of Bray, we cannot think that the change which came over the Irish Church either destroyed her existence as a branch of CHRIST'S Church, or diminished her right to her ancient inheritance. What has been most remarkable in her history has been the tenacity with which she has clung to her union with the Church of England. There was a short time indeed when the Lambeth articles which had been rejected in England were received in Ireland, but this divergence was speedily rectified by the substitution of the English Articles by the Irish Convocation of 1634, simply on the ground of the entire agreement between the two Churches.

Considering the causes of weakness which have hindered the Irish Church we may be surprised that she has been able to hold her ground at all. Her work of evangelizing has been constantly impeded by the ill-judged interference of the State. Not only did the Roman schism keep the Irish Church in a state of chronic excitement, but within the fold itself divisions were aroused.

Clergymen were sent over from England to fill the highest offices in the Church for the advancement, not of religion, but of the English interest; and oftentimes Irish sees and benefices were conferred on those whom it would not have been respectable to have promoted at home. From 1703 to 1822 no Irishman filled the office of Irish Primate, and during the same period there were six English and only four Irishmen promoted to the Archbishopric of Dublin. Each Viceroy, of which there was a quick succession, brought with him a chaplain, who claimed as his perquisite the first bishopric which fell vacant. These things naturally aroused the jealousy of the clergy whose claims were thus passed over, and soon resulted in the establishment of an English and Irish party in the Church who, naturally jealous of each other, were incapable of combined or harmonious action.

The English Government promoted emigration to Ireland as a means of increasing their influence, and made large grants of land to those who would accept them. These colonists became naturally the chief care of the Irish Church, when the native peasantry were repelled from her communion; but when times were bad and the Anglo-Irish fell into the peasant class, they naturally adopted their social habits and their religion also. The Irish Church was the Church of the respectable class, and those who had fallen into a lower grade grew jealous of a Church whose associations reminded them of the position from which they had fallen. Emigration to the colonies was also a source of numerical weakness to the Irish Church. Until the middle of the present century the tide of emigration was entirely confined to the Irish Church and the Protestant denominations. When times were bad the Roman Catholic peasantry clung with tenacity to their native soil, while others were content to seek their fortunes in new homes. In the early days of emigration, therefore, the chief loss fell upon the Irish Church, but in the twenty-seven years which elapsed between 1834 and 1861, when the whole population has decreased 27.1 per cent, and the Roman Catholics have lost one third of their whole number, and the Presbyterians between one fifth and one sixth, the Irish Church has only lost between one seventh and one eighth; so that compared with the Roman Catholics and Presbyterians the Irish Church may be said to be on the increase, a circumstance which no doubt augments the jealousy of her enemies. And the influence of the Irish Church has not been lost upon the emigrants. The seed which has been sown has borne fruit in foreign countries, as was attested by the Bishop of Ontario, who said at the Church Congress, at Manchester, that two thirds of the congregations in his diocese consisted of Irish Protestants, and that these were the best men and the best churchmen. But even whilst so large a number of the peasantry has been withdrawn by emigration, the average number of Church members in each parish is scarcely inferior to

what we find in England. In Ireland, the average number of Church members in a town parish is 1590, and in a rural parish 376, while in England the average number in a rural parish is 387, showing a difference only of 11. In Wales it only reaches 248, so that in Wales there is on this plea greater reason for the confiscation of Church property than in Ireland. It has been ascertained that the average number of Church members under each clergyman in Ireland, having cure of souls, is 458. We often hear of parishes in which there is not a single Irish Churchman, but this statement is dishonest, when it is made without the explanation that in Ireland several parishes are now united in one benefice. Many hamlets might be found in parts of England and Wales, in which there is not a single Churchman; but this does not prove that the parish priest has nothing to do, or that there is not a large population which accepts his services, and recognises his office. But after all, it is no question of numbers, but one which involves the great Catholic principle, that the existence of a Church depends, not on the accidental circumstance of numerical increase or decrease, but upon the unbroken succession of her Bishops canonically consecrated, and maintaining the faith which they have received from ancient times.

Respecting the endowments of the Irish Church we quote the words of Dr. Alfred Lee, as a brief statement of the conclusion at which we had arrived by independent inquiry.

"We have already seen that tithes were first regularly paid in Ireland after its conquest by Henry II. Since that period, in consequence of successive rebellions, every acre in Ireland has become forfeited to the Crown. The title then of all the present landlords, when traced to its original source, rests on the bounty of the Crown of England; and when they received their estates originally, they received them subject to the rights of the Church. Tithes therefore were never part of any lay property now in existence, and of late years they have been commuted for a tithe rent charge on terms very favourable to the landed proprietors. The assertion, therefore, so often made, that the Roman Catholics, who form the great majority of the Irish people, are compelled to pay to the support of a Church to which they do not belong, *has no foundation whatever in fact.* We shall desire no better testimony on this point than that of Sir George C. Lewis, the late lamented Chancellor of the Exchequer. 'The grievance,' said he, 'is commonly stated to be that the Roman Catholics are compelled to contribute by the payment of tithes to the support of a Church from which they differ. Now, in fact, the Roman Catholics, although they may pay tithes, contribute nothing, inasmuch as in Ireland tithe is of the nature, not of a tax, but of a reserved rent which never belonged either to landlord or tenant.' When therefore a landlord, Protestant or Roman Catholic, pays this rent charge to the incumbent of his parish, he pays nothing out of his own pocket, but only that reserved rent subject to which he received his property, and for the regular payment of which

he is permitted by law to deduct the handsome fee of 25 per cent."—
P. 248.

The tithe rent charge of Ireland amounts to £401,114 a year, and it has been accurately ascertained that for eight ninths of this protestant landlords are responsible. Roman Catholic landlords have therefore a very small grievance, since eight ninths of the soil are in the hands of protestants. We should doubt whether in England eight ninths of those who pay the tithe rent charge are members of the Church of England.

Besides the tithe, which was the ancient inheritance of the Church, and existed, although it was not regularly paid, before the synod of Cashel, Irish Church property has consisted of grants made to Norman monasteries between the invasion and Reformation, and endowments given to the Church by James I. and the two Charleses. The first of these the Roman Catholics might have some shadow of a claim to, since they were given to the Church at a time when she was under the dominion of Rome, but at the Reformation they were all confiscated, together with much ancient ecclesiastical property, and granted to laymen. If therefore the Roman communion in Ireland has any claim to make, it is not to the Irish Church, but to the present possessors of the abbey lands. To the grants which have been made since the Reformation no one will deny that the Irish Church has an exclusive claim. The real truth is, therefore, that whilst Roman Catholics and Presbyterians receive annual payments from the State, the Irish Church possesses no property to which she has not as just a title as that by which every landed proprietor holds his estates.

In spite of the weakness which has afflicted the Irish Church ever since the Reformation, she has not been wanting in great names which have been enrolled in the annals of the universal Church. She has had an Ussher, a Bramhall, and a Bedell; Jeremy Taylor, Berkeley, Magee, and more than we can name, have made her modern episcopate illustrious; Mant, Graves, Archer Butler, and Lee have contributed much to the learning of the age. The noble munificence of the late Primate and of that large-hearted layman who has undertaken, at a cost of £150,000, the restoration of the cathedral of S. Patrick, is worthy of any age or of any branch of CHRIST'S Church. The Church of Ireland may yet have a great career before her. She may now be far behind us in the revival of Catholic doctrine and ritual, but she has begun to show signs of life, the mere negative teaching of protestantism is beginning to be supplanted by something better, and she is now more free to act on her own religious instincts than ever she has been before. The Church of England would be neglecting the duty of her position if she did not do what she could for the protection of her sister of Ireland. The appeal is made to public

opinion whether the revenues of the Irish Church shall be confiscated or preserved, and English generosity and justice need only to be cleared from the misrepresentations which have been scattered abroad by the enemies of the Church, and we feel confident that the united voice of all English Churchmen will demand that no wrong be done to the Irish Church.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Church Doctrines Proved by the Bible. Masters.

THIS little book is written in a charming and useful style. It is evidently the production of a thoughtful and truly Catholic mind, that is capable of discerning the mysterious spiritual meaning which is often hidden beneath the smallest word in Holy Scripture. And though we think the title of this book would lead persons to expect something fuller in detail, and more theoretical in character, yet we are sure that it will serve a valuable purpose to any who are thoughtfully inclined, and especially to the young.

To all who would find out the precious spiritual treasures contained in the simplest facts of the Bible, this little work is very suggestive. We should imagine, from its general tone, that the book is written by a woman. We do not say this to the disparagement of the work. On the contrary, the simplicity of the author's style we consider will add much to its usefulness; for many, who would find it impossible to wade through a theological treatise, could easily follow in the author's steps, and learn to discern in the letter of the sacred Scriptures the Spirit of the Almighty Author.

We will now give a general idea of the little book. Each short chapter is headed by a verse of the Bible, and this is enlarged upon in its spiritual and typical bearings; and the very instructive way in which the author shows what lies hid in many of the simpler narratives of the Bible, cannot fail in pleasing all reverent minds. We do not mean that there is anything at all original in this way of thinking; but we would wish to see this devout habit of regarding God's holy Word become general. (1.) The typical nature of the history of the creation; of the new creation of man in CHRIST by the waters of baptism, whereby man is enabled to bring forth abundantly, by the vivifying influence of the HOLY SPIRIT, those abundant graces which will lead him to eternal life. We do not quite like the fanciful way in which those graces are represented as developing in the soul, i.e., one by one. The baptised, or regenerate, are at once intrusted with the righteousness of CHRIST, and the gradual sanctification of the whole life, is the true way of expressing the Christian's growth. As the first creation was perfect from God's Hand, so is the second. We do not think, however, that the author uses the terms justification or sanctification at all.

The second chapter, headed, "A garden inclosed is My sister, My

spouse, a spring shut up, a fountain sealed," (Song of Solomon.) ~~is~~ really beautifully developed. The Church is set forth in her oneness with CHRIST, her discipline, her beauty, and her safety.

The third chapter on the Blessed Virgin's life is equally good. But there seems to be not a very clear distinction in the author's mind between heaven and paradise (page 16.)

We may instance Chapter VII., on 2 Kings v. 12, as being well written. It is a supposed colloquy between the Church and Schism.

We must, however, make two exceptions to our entire approval. The first is, that the author's interpretation of Jacob's ladder is not that which Catholic theologians assign to it—viz., as being symbolical of the Incarnation. The second, is the treatment of the scene at Tiberias, which is both obscure and fanciful.

Dores de Gualdim. London: Parker.

THE twenty-eighth number of Messrs. Parker's "Historical Church Tales," which is rather late in its appearance, gives a graphic account of the Portuguese Revolution of 1640, in which a band of only forty gallant men succeeded in deposing Philip IV., and placing the Duke of Bragança, afterwards known as João IV. on the throne. This revolution was distinguished by its bloodless character, (only three lives having been taken,) and by the noble conduct of Pinto Ribero, who was, as the author expresses it, "the heart and soul of the movement;" but the most interesting part of the work is, perhaps, the account of the sermon of Antonio Vieira, the great Brazilian Preacher. As for the rest of the tale, it requires not only a thorough knowledge of Portuguese history, but also of one of the previous works of the author in the present series rightly to understand all its details.

Illustrations of Scripture History from the Monuments of Egypt, Chaldæa, Assyria, and Babylonia. London: Lothian and Co.

THIS little book will be valuable to many who either have not access to larger works, or have not time to read them. In a small compass it contains a vast amount of history, and well fulfils the intention of the author. The chapter on the Mosaic account of the Creation is worthy of notice, and in extracting a single paragraph from it, we shall best illustrate the reverent tone in which it is written:

"It is a remarkable fact that every pretended and false revelation has pledged itself to false scientific statements (as the Koran and the sacred books of the Hindoos.) In the Bible alone can we find an account of creation, which, consistent with the highest state of true science, has not been above the comprehension of simple and unlearned men of every age."—P. 61.

The Little Primer; a Handbook of Christian Doctrine, Practice, and Devotion. By a Mission Priest. London: Palmer.

IT is no contradiction to say that the simplest things are sometimes the most difficult to perform rightly. Those who have had to pro-

ide prayers for common people will have learnt the truth of this remark, for they will know that among the multitude of books of devotions which they have tried for this class of persons, they have scarcely found one with which they are satisfied. To all such we confidently recommend "The Little Primer." The compiler seems really to have had in view the benefit of the persons who should use the manual, rather than the foisting in some particular views of his own. As the title would lead us to expect, the prayers do not come first in the book; but when we arrive at them, they are as short and simple as it is possible to desire. The "Instructions" also are not embarrassed with unnecessary details, or the recommendation of unusual practices, excepting only what we think had better have been omitted, the mention of anointing the sick with oil. In our judgment there must certainly more injury be done to a sick man by suggesting this usage to him, which he knows is not practised ordinarily in the English Church, than good can be expected from the chance of its being used beneficially for him. The drawback to the book is its expensiveness. Fourpence is far too much to charge for what is intended only for the poorest and least instructed.

In *The Calendar of the Prayer Book* (Parker) we find an old friend under a new name, and with some changes implied is the change of name. In some respects the present work is an improvement on the "Calendar of the Anglican Church." The chapter on Emblems and Symbols is enlarged both by multiplied illustrations and by additional information; but we are sorry to see the omission of the second part of the former work, which treated of Saints, known mainly by the dedication of churches in England or by some historical connection. Such are S. Aidan, Bishop of Lindisfarne, "the Apostle of the north of England," S. Cuthbert, S. Frideswide, S. Thomas of Canterbury, S. Hilda, S. Margaret of Scotland, and many more especially dear to England; and also S. Benedict, S. Clara, &c., of wider renown. We cannot see any object in this change, and in spite of the additions to the engravings which we gladly note, we hardly think that there is sufficient compensation for what we have lost. We are sorry to see wrong derivations of "Ember" (which indubitably is a corruption of "quatuor tempora,") and of Lammas. Whitsun is left without any derivation, we perceive.

Ivon (Masters) is a reprint of a tale which appeared in the "Churchman's Companion," and was justly commended by the reviewers when it was passing through that periodical. Without showing any great originality, it is an interesting story of which the tone throughout is excellent.

Many of our readers may not be aware, that a combination had been entered into among some of the head-masters of our public schools, with the view of carrying into effect a recommendation of the recent Commission, that there should be one grammar generally adopted. A large body of under-masters, as well as masters of smaller schools that had not been consulted, appear to be against the system which

it is proposed to adopt, and they have found a spokesman in the Rev. EDWARD MILLER, who has put forth an important pamphlet on the subject, which is published by Parker.

We welcome from Mr. PLOWS, *The Litany of the Love of God, noted and pointed*, (Novello, and Masters,) which we doubt not would be found popular in schools.

Mr. SHIPLEY'S *Liturgies of 1549 and 1662*, (Masters,) printed in parallel columns, is more than a mere literary contribution to liturgical study. In the Preface he considers the question how far it might be possible to restore some of the lost features of the Office of 1549. This he does in a tone of moderation which will commend his remarks to many readers. For ourselves we should be content with the one change of again putting the Prayer of Humble Access in the only place where it can have any real meaning, i.e., after the Consecration.

Besides the volume of Essays already reviewed, two smaller publications have appeared on the subject of the Irish Church: one a clear and convincing paper read by Mr. BINGHAM at a meeting of the Wilts Church Union, (Church Press Company;) the other by Archdeacon WORDSWORTH, which is a condensed statement of what he had before published, marked by all his energy and learning. (Rivingtons.)

Dr. WORDSWORTH, who appears always to be noting the signs of the times, gives us another pamphlet, also compressed from a larger work, deprecating "Union with Rome" on the ground that she is the Babylon of the Apocalypse. We do not think that he need be in any fear that such union will be accomplished in his day.

Miss Chester's Work (Masters) is a tale calculated to do good in two ways. First, it casts a kind of halo round honest poverty, to which it is justly entitled; and secondly, it affords an elevating view of what Christian charity really is.

We are glad that Mr. UPTON RICHARDS, who does not often appear in print, has yielded to the "request" made to him by the members of "the Confraternity of the Blessed Sacrament" to publish the *Sermon* which he preached at their recent commemoration. The sermon takes its name as well as its leading ideas from Mr. Keble's treatise on "Eucharistic Adoration," and is written in a persuasive and uncontroversial spirit. (Masters.)

Mr. LOCKHART has published his *Review of Dr. Pusey's Eirenicon* in a separate pamphlet, (Longmans,) which he dedicates to "John Henry Newman and Edward Bouverie Pusey, two venerable and beloved names that one loves in thought to associate together." This gives promise of a fairness which is hardly realized in what follows. Thus he speaks again and again of the Church being founded on "the rock of Peter," as if S. Paul had never spoken of its being "built upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets" collectively.

We are glad to receive a word in behalf of *The Sunday School*, (Masters,) from our old friend, the Vicar of Chard. The Church cannot afford to neglect that which has proved itself so powerful an institution.

DR. WORDSWORTH ON THE BOOK OF JUDGES.

The Holy Bible, with Notes and Introductions. By CHRISTOPHER WORDSWORTH, D.D., Archdeacon of Westminster. Joshua, Judges, Ruth. London: Rivingtons.

IN the March number of the *Ecclesiastic*, we commenced a review of Dr. Wordsworth's "Commentary on the Old Testament," which we intended to carry on through the several volumes, as they successively appeared. The second volume, however, has not been sent to us, and therefore we have been compelled to forego our purpose.

The "Commentary on the Book of Judges," however, possesses very peculiar characteristics of its own, and we shall confine this article to the illustration of what is decidedly the most remarkable feature in Dr. Wordsworth's Annotations, and which is more fully exhibited in this book than in any of the preceding ones: we mean the spiritual sense of Holy Scripture.

A subject this undoubtedly is which is well worth devout consideration, especially in this day, when so many religious persons are in the habit of regarding the Bible as a mere record of historical acts of a sacred or political nature.

The dangers of thus reading the Holy Volume are twofold. (1.) Even humble and reverent Christians, who would tremble to question the inspiration of the least word or fact contained in the Scriptures, yet miss their whole spiritual aim and object, by considering only their moral and personal significance. They lower the general tone of the Bible, recognising the outward without discerning the inward and spiritual meaning. In the same way this class of persons receive the consecrated elements in the Holy Eucharist with reverence and devotion, but, failing to recognise the spiritual part in the Sacrament, they discern but bread and wine, instead of the glorified Body of the risen CHRIST.

(2.) The second danger is even more serious in its effects, because it besets the more thinking and intellectual portion of readers, whose influence is often both extensive and powerful. This class of persons, who enter upon the study of the Bible, depending on the strength of their own intellect, can find ample scope for argument and controversy. But the very fact that it is impossible for two persons to read the Scriptures by the light of their own reason only, and be agreed, proves the inscrutable wisdom of the Almighty Author, Who has placed His Divine Revelation so far above all human productions, that it cannot be read aright but by the HOLY SPIRIT'S direction. Unassisted human intellect cannot penetrate

beyond the letter ; thus discrepancies and contradictions are evident, which would even be carped at in any mere human production. In fact, the natural man does undoubtedly find many things in Holy Scripture which he considers unworthy the Mind of Almighty God, and also many other records which, as matters of history, are useless, or unworthy to be noted, and therefore he concludes that the Bible is man's work. His own faint and uncertain light casts but a fitful shadow upon the Divine Treasures contained in each portion of Holy Writ ; and all is either darkness to him, or he sees it distorted through his own imperfect vision. The glorious light of the Spirit of God alone is capable of revealing the depths of Divine wisdom in the Bible which human reason dreams not of. By that light alone can the chaos of interpretations, suggested by the natural man, be reduced to order and perfection. To use a simile : We know that at night, or by twilight, or even by moonlight, all common objects around us appear with distorted forms, some are elongated, some are contracted, and the like. Many, also, are not visible at all, or they assume some character altogether opposite to that which really belongs to them. A curtain takes the human shape ; a beautiful statue that of some unearthly living form, and even a shadow is transformed, in appearance, into some formidable monster ; and we know, again, that to no two persons do the same objects appear alike. And why ? We can only see clearly when the sun is fully risen. And when once he has cast his bright beams around, all things that appeared before twisted, deformed, and out of place, assume their proper proportions and positions—forms and characters which have always belonged to them, though our unassisted vision had failed to distinguish aright. The curtain is no longer a human being ; monsters disappear, leaving necessary and comprehensible objects while trivial things, which were invisible before, stand out full in view ; gaps fill in, previously inexplicable, which we had left either vacant, or more likely had allowed our own fancies to people. Now all persons see the same objects. In fact, what had been confusion and distortion is now order and beauty.

We need scarcely carry this simple analogy further. But this we know, that the feeble spark of man's intellect fails entirely to penetrate the spiritual significance of Holy Scripture. The greater the intellect, the greater the danger of self-dependence. For confined to the still narrow limits of his own understanding, perfection takes the form of incompleteness and mistake because, perhaps, it cannot be submitted to mathematical rule ; truth appears error, and God's wisdom is set aside as foolishness. Thus man unwittingly darkens the windows of his soul, and glories in his own conclusions and calculations, however distorted and terrible they may be, and he does not believe that God's truth can be anything which he cannot comprehend. Only when the Bible is read by the

in the light of the Sun of Righteousness is the harmony and perfection of the whole made clear and manifest.

These remarks have a direct bearing on the book of Holy Scripture before us, which, as all persons know, contains a record of events which might be called trivial, and of personages of no great historical importance.

The following extract from the introduction to the Book of Judges, which we give in starting, is an illustration of the reverent manner in which Dr. Wordsworth interprets Holy Scripture, with a reference always to the spiritual meaning of the minutest circumstance recorded therein. And we can scarcely think that any devout person can read this Commentary and not be convinced of the importance and value of regarding the Old Testament as having a constant spiritual bearing upon God's dealings with man as they are revealed to us in the New Testament. Such was the mind of the ancient Church; and if the typical nature of the entire records of the Jewish Dispensation be not recognised, and the spirit of the whole be not understood as bearing a direct testimony to the Christian Dispensation, the Old Testament is read in vain, for unless these principles are accepted, it follows that no thinking mind can read without irreverent criticisms. But to quote—

“But let us ask this question—What *ancient* expositor of this Book ever thought of commenting on the history of Jael, a woman pointed out by the voice of prophecy as the future destroyer of Sisera (the captain of the hosts of the aliens arrayed against the armies of the God of Israel,) and endued with supernatural power to accomplish the purpose, which she was stirred up by a supernatural impulse to attempt, and executing that purpose by driving through his head the nail of wood by which her tent was kept firm—who (I ask) in ancient times ever dreamt of expounding this marvellous history, without reference to the deed done, according to ancient prophecy, by the Seed of the woman, bruising the head of our spiritual Sisera by the wood of His Cross, and to the spiritual work of the Christian Church, by the reaching of the doctrine of the Cross, by which the tent of the Church settled in the truth, and is able to overcome her enemies? Who among the ancient readers of this Book thought that he could understand the history of Gideon aright, except he saw in the history of Gideon's fleece, and of the threshing-floor around it, an image of the Jewish Church, and of the Church Universal? As the dew was first on the Fleece, and not on the Floor, so the dews of God's Spirit were first on the Jewish people, and the World around it was dry. But afterwards the dews of the Spirit fell on the floor of the World, and the Jewish Fleece is now dry. What ancient expositor ever supposed that he had communicated the true meaning of the history of Gideon to his hearers, or his readers, without profiting by the suggestions of the Spirit of God, speaking by the prophet Isaiah, connecting the ‘day of Midian’ with the victory of God Incarnate; and without pointing their thoughts to a greater GIDEON, Who is the true Jerubbaal, and Who has destroyed the idolatrous altars of this world, and Who has

routed the immense hosts of the spiritual Midians by the sound of the trumpets of His Gospel, and by the breaking of the earthen pitchers, in the martyrdoms of His servants—shattered in death for His sake; and by the flashing forth of the light of the Gospel from those earthen vessels, by their sufferings in life and death? Who among the ancient expositors ever commented on the history of Abimelech, usurping the throne of Israel at Shechem, in the very sanctuary of God, and falling at last by means of his own usurpation, without seeing there a foreshadowing of Antichrist? Who, in the better days of the Church, ever read the history of Jephthah and of his rash vow, and of the meekness and self-sacrifice of his daughter, without seeing there a marvellous and mysterious adumbration of a better sacrifice of another soul, of an Only Child, perfectly free and voluntary, and of virgin holiness and heavenly purity, and yet in a certain sense necessary, as due to the sins of those who nailed it to the Cross, the sacrifice of CHRIST, Who gave His spotless soul to death for our sakes? Who ever preached a homily in the ancient churches of Christendom on the wonderful feats of Samson, without reminding his hearers that they ought not to be surprised into unbelief by those marvels? And wherefore not? Because a greater than Samson is here. A Samson, and more than a Samson, in strength and spiritual gifts. One Who shines forth as a perfect example of the *right* use of spiritual gifts, whereas Samson stands out to the world as a solemn warning against their *abuse*. Who ever preached a sermon in ancient times on the history of Samson without reminding his audience of One Who did not despise His own Nation as Samson did, but was despised by it; One Who did indeed espouse a Bride from the Heathen as Samson did, and One Who never lost her, as Samson did; One Who encountered the Lion, as Samson did, even that roaring Lion who is ever going about to devour us, and Who gathered honey out of his carcase, and is ever giving that honey to us; One Who gathered the honey of Divine Truth out of the carcase of vanquished Error; One Who gathered the honey of life eternal out of His conflict with Death; One Who, by dying, gave Immortality to man; One Who, out of the prostrate bodies of Sin, Satan, and the Grave, gathered for us the honey of spiritual sweetness and heavenly joy; One Who was meek and lowly, as Samson was in his modest beginnings, and Who never degenerated, as he did, but continued meek to the end, even though His acts became more and more glorious as He approached that end; One Who overthrew His thousands and tens of thousands by the foolishness of preaching, as Samson slew the Philistines by a despised instrument, the jaw-bone of an ass; One Who sought not honour for Himself, but for His FATHER; One Who did not glorify His own arm, as Samson did; One Who never did a single act with a view to personal revenge, as Samson did his deeds of valour, but did all for the public good of the world and for the glory of God; One Who awoke at midnight from sleep—even from the sleep of death—in the strong city of a spiritual Gaza, even in the fortress of Satan, even in the fortress of Death and the Grave, and broke asunder its iron bars and brazen bolts, and carried them away on His shoulders toward the top of a heavenly Hebron, and proclaimed Victory and Resurrection to the world; One Who was a Nazarite indeed, sanctified to God from His

mother's womb; One Who 'was in all points tempted like as we are,' at Who never allowed the seven locks of His head—the sevenfold gifts of the Spirit—to be woven by any Delilah of sensual delight into the web of voluptuous ease, or to be shorn by an unhallowed hand while He lay in the lap of worldly allurements or earthly fascinations, but Who preserved those spiritual locks unscathed and holy to the end; Who had never His eyes put out, but Who is the Light of the World; and Who entered the Prison of the Grave in order to disarm the jailor, and to deliver the world out of prison, and Who, though He overthrew more at His death than in His life, yet it was not that His own body might remain buried in the confused heap of ruins of some Dagon's Temple amid the bodies of Philistines, but that it might arise again from the grave to glory, and ascend in triumph to heaven, and sit down on the right hand of GOD, and bring us to that glorious altitude where He Himself is, and that we might be ever with the LORD?

"We have here a striking example of that which meets us continually in this book, and indeed throughout the Old Testament. The Antitype corrects the Type. Wherever Samson diverges from the right line of obedience, there the example of CHRIST comes in to rectify the aberration, and wherever the weakness and wilfulness of Samson bring him down to defeat and shame, there the steadfastness and obedience of CHRIST raise Him up to victory and glory. Both the Type and the Antitype cheer the Church in days of sorrow and distress, with assurances of the power of the Spirit; and while the Type in Samson warns her against the abuse of spiritual gifts, the Antitype in CHRIST teaches her how to use them aright.

"This remark may be extended further. The Judges of Israel were types of CHRIST in all they *did well*, but in nothing *that they did ill*. In this latter respect they are *contrasts* to CHRIST. And it will generally be found that wherever they acted amiss, CHRIST's example supplies the *antithesis* and *antidote* (if we may so speak) to their sins. Hideon's polygamy and his Ephod find their correctives in CHRIST's love for His Church, which is One, though formed out of all nations, and in His Priesthood confirmed to Him by the FATHER, Who said, 'Thou art a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedek.' Wherever the Types err, the Antitype rises up in a noble and sublime contrast, like some bold cliff and lofty rock over against a dangerous quicksand, to point out the error and to establish the opposite truth."—Pp. 78, 79.

This, we think, gives a key to the Author's powers of appreciating the spiritual significance of the Old Testament history, and his keen conviction of the utter impossibility of separating what God in His divine mind hath joined together.

But we must proceed to enter further into detail.

Dr. Wordsworth, in the first place, shows the general typical relation between the Book of Judges and the Acts of the Apostles, and the Book of Revelation. This is very striking and instructive, and the statement is well carried out, viz., that what the former is to the Old Testament, the latter are to the New. To give his arguments in substance: it cannot be reverently imagined

that it is owing to any mere accident that the number of the Judges of Israel exactly corresponds with the number of the Apostles. And though it is not to be understood that there is any individual typical bearing, yet the general history of the Judges is a direct foreshadowing of the Apostolic Church of CHRIST.

Besides this, there are certain other special reasons given, which prove the relation before stated. (1.) The Book of Judges comes directly after that of Joshua, who was a figure of JESUS; and the Acts of the Apostles follows immediately upon the Gospels, which relate the acts of JESUS Himself. (2.) The one shows the miraculous work of the HOLY GHOST in those who were raised up to deliver Israel; the other displays the wonderful working of the HOLY SPIRIT in the Apostles, who were set up like judges in the Christian Church. (3.) Both are books of encouragement to the Church in every age and country.

Further, there is what we may call a negative resemblance between these two books, which consists not in what they contain or say, but in what they do not say, and chiefly in the very little that is recorded of the doings and sufferings of either Judges or Apostles. Of the latter only two are brought prominently forward, viz., S. Peter and S. Paul. Concerning this feature in the relation traced we give an extract from the Introduction again.

"If we read the history of the first two Judges, (Othniel and Ehud,) who delivered Israel from the oppressive rule of the kings of Mesopotamia and of Moab; and if in reading that history we do not raise our thoughts from them to other adversaries, we are without the proper key which unlocks the spiritual instruction to be derived from this history. We read it 'with a veil on the heart;' we are the slaves of 'the letter which killeth;' and we shall be perplexed, staggered, and revolted by such details as occur in the history of Ehud; and perhaps we may be tempted to join with those who ask in the language of scorn, Are such incidents as these worthy to be recorded by the HOLY GHOST? Can these narrations be parts of Holy Scripture? And if so, can it be true, that 'all Scripture is given by inspiration of GOD?' Can 'all Scripture' be said to be 'profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness?' Can it be said to be written 'for our admonition?' Can it be true that '*whatsoever* things were written aforetime, were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope?'—Pp. 76, 77.

The answers to these queries we give in Dr. Wordsworth's own words, from the Commentary on the acts of Othniel and Ehud.

"Of him (S. Peter,) it may be said in an eminent degree, as it is of Othniel, 'The Spirit of the LORD was upon him.' That Spirit made him a new man. Othniel stands first among the Judges—Peter holds the first place in all the lists of the Apostles. (S. Matth. x. 2; S. Mark iii. 16; S. Luke vi. 14; Acts i. 13.) Othniel was of the tribe of Judah, Peter was specially the Apostle of the Jews. (Gal. ii. 7.) Othniel was

married, so was S. Peter; and if we may believe the ancient history of a wife's courage, she was a worthy antitype of a daughter of Caleb, see Euseb. H. E. iii. 30, and below on 1 S. Pet. iii. 6,) and was clothed with the upper and nether springs of Divine grace. Othniel prevailed over *Chushan-rishathaim*, whose name betokens a double form of evil. It is remarkable, that S. Peter was the first of the Apostles who prevailed over the stubbornness of the Jews, and over the wisdom and strength of the Gentile world. He had the keys of the Word and Sacraments, by which he opened the kingdom of heaven to the Jews at Jerusalem on the day of Pentecost, and to Cornelius the centurion, the first-fruits of the Gentiles, at Cæsarea (see Acts ii. 14, 33; x. 34, 48; xv. 7.) The victory of Othniel was gained over a king of *Mesopotamia*, or *Babylonia*. The first converts of S. Peter mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles, came from Babylon (see on Acts ix. 9.) His first Epistle is dated from Babylon (see on 1 S. Pet. v. 13;) and if we may take *Babylonia* in a spiritual sense as well as a literal, it gained a great victory in the Western Babylon—Rome, when he received the crown of a glorious martyrdom there (see below, the Introduction to his Epistles, p. 69.)

"It is, therefore, submitted to the learned reader's consideration, whether the work wrought by CHRIST and the HOLY SPIRIT in the Church of GOD by the instrumentality of S. Peter, the first Apostle, may not have been foreshadowed by the work which GOD wrought by the agency of Othniel, the first Judge?"—P. 93.

The allusions to Ehud as being the type of S. Paul are by no means less instructive.


"Ehud was of the tribe of Benjamin: so was S. Paul (Rom. xi. 1; Phil. iii. 5.) *Ehud* signifies *uniting*; S. Paul was a Hebrew of the Hebrews (2 Cor. xi. 22; Phil. iii. 5,) and yet was the Apostle of the Gentiles (Rom. xi. 13; Gal. ii. 7, 8.) He was zealous for the Law, and yet he contended earnestly—even against S. Peter himself—for the rights of the Gentiles (Gal. ii. 11—15.) No one man ever did so much as S. Paul, by preaching and acting, to *unite* Jew and Gentile in the same mystical body—the Body of CHRIST. He was the Ehud of the Gospel. Ehud used his left hand, and with it drew the sword by which he destroyed the enemy of God's people. S. Paul did not use that arm which most men would use: he seemed to many to be 'left-handed,' awkward, in wielding the weapons of eloquence. He did not wage war against heathenism with words of man's wisdom (1 Cor. ii. 4;) his bodily presence seemed to be weak, and his speech contemptible (2 Cor. x. 10;) he did not use the arm with which men wield the sword, but that on which they wear the shield. Faith was his shield (Eph. vi. 16;) it was his sword also with which he overcame the world. Ehud made a dagger which had two edges (v. 16;) or, rather, a *two-edged sword*. The *Septuagint* has there *μάχαιραν δίστομον*, and the apostle himself adopts those very words, and applies them to the Word of GOD (Heb. iv. 12;) and the Word of GOD is called by him the word of the Spirit (Eph. vi. 17; cp. Rev. i. 16; ii. 12.) Ehud went with his two-edged sword to the city of Jericho. The king of Moab

was sitting at ease there, and kept his court therein, and tyrannise over the people of God. And when Ehud saw the idols at Gilgal (see v. 19) his spirit was stirred within him, and he went to the palace of the king, and he said, I have a secret errand (or rather, 'a hidden word') to thee, O king (v. 19.) I have a message from God, or rather, I have a *word of God* to thee (see v. 20.) Eglon is described as a corpulent man. Fatness is noted in the Scripture as a figure of pride, sensuality, and lust (see above, on vv. 12—17;) and the part of the body in which the wound was inflicted, and all the circumstances of its infliction, and their consequences, are described with mysterious minuteness. S. Paul had a mission to the Gentile world, especially to its Jerichos—its great cities. He went with the sword of the Spirit to fight against Heathenism at Thessalonica, at Athens, at Corinth, at Ephesus, and at Rome. None of the Apostles, as far as we know, did what S. Paul did in this respect. When he was at Athens, the spirit of this great apostolic Ehud was stirred within him, as he saw the city wholly given to idolatry (Acts xvii. 16.) He boldly declared that they had fallen away from the religion which even their own poets had taught (Acts xvii. 28,) and much more from primitive truth (Ib. xvii. 24,) and that they ought not to deem the Godhead to be like to graven images. And what was the spirit which ruled in those great cities?—Carnal lust and voluptuousness, an Eglon: that corpulent gross tyrant 'whose end is destruction, whose god is its belly, which minds earthly things,' (Phil. iii. 19; Rom. xvi. 18.) S. Paul came to this unwieldy despot, lazily sitting at ease in his summer-parlour, in the cities and palaces of this world, which he had usurped. He came to him with a two-edged sword, 'the Word of God;' and his language to him was, I have a '*hidden Word*' to thee. We speak, he says, to the most voluptuous of all cities, Corinth, 'the wisdom of God in a mystery, even the *hidden* wisdom which God ordained before the world unto our glory, which none of the princes of this world knew,' (1 Cor. ii. 6.) I have a Word of God for thee. With this Word he stabbed the carnal Tyrant who domineered over the world. '*Mortify* your members on the earth, fornication, uncleanness, inordinate affection, evil concupiscence, and covetousness,' (Col. iii. 5.) 'Ye are dead, and your life is hid with CHRIST in God,' (Col. iii. 3.) 'They that are CHRIST's have *crucified the flesh* with the affections and lusts,' (Gal. v. 24.) He preached the doctrine of the Incarnation; he taught that by Baptism men's bodies are made members of CHRIST, and temples of the HOLY GHOST, and that they will be raised again from the dead; and if their carnal appetites have been mortified here, they will be made like unto CHRIST's glorious body hereafter (1 Cor. vi. 15, 19; xii. 13, 27; xv. 44; Phil. iii. 21;) and with this sword of the Spirit he destroyed the Eglons of this world, and blew the trumpet of the Gospel, and routed the Moabites, and delivered Israel, and destroyed the idols of heathenism, and restored the worship of God. Let us listen to S. Paul's teaching, and be Ehuds to ourselves. Let us make (what an English Bishop calls) 'an intestine slaughter of our own tyrannical corruptions.' Let us mortify and kill our own Eglons in our own Jerichos, in the summer-chambers of our own hearts, and we shall not have read this history in vain."—P. 96.

Now upon the doings of almost all the other Apostles, Holy Scripture, as we know, is silent in this book, several even are not mentioned. So also of the Judges, but few are chosen to stand prominently forward, most of them being only known to us in name. Many records also, which to a human author would be deemed most essential, are entirely left out in both books, and this constitutes what we have called the negative resemblance between them. But as Dr. Wordsworth reverently remarks, "there is inspiration in this silence;" and none but the Divine Author could have maintained the same wise and impartial silence, throughout. For we are sure that in the Almighty's plans, even the smallest detail of those on whom He sent His Holy Spirit, was necessary; and by His wisdom He has shown us that "men are only instruments in His hand, and that the world's fame is not to be coveted, but that which is to be desired is the approval of God, who has before His eyes an Acts of the Apostles, in which every act of every Apostle is recorded."

Thus we may be certain, that all things spoken of in the Bible, however trivial, are mentioned according to the Almighty will of God, and all omissions have equally His unerring sanction, and apparent mistakes, however seemingly great, are by the light of inspiration perhaps the most essential features in the Sacred Book. If the Omnipotent Creator had given us His whole mind, if the Scriptures had been the entire thoughts of Him Who filleth all things, we know that "the world itself could not contain the books that should have been written." But from the unfathomable depths of His own eternal wisdom He alone could extract (as it were) and still give a perfect whole, leaving nothing unsaid that it was needful to know, and saying not one word that His own infinite knowledge had not duly measured.

To come now to the second, which we consider the most important, first commented on by Dr. Wordsworth, viz., the resemblance of the Book of Judges to that of the Apocalypse. We feel that here, indeed, Dr. Wordsworth is anything but a trustworthy guide, because it is in the interpretation of the Apocalypse that his peculiar and uncatholic views especially come out. At the same time he aims to touch upon the borders of a sound exegesis which is capable of being drawn out, we believe, at considerable length, and in a way calculated to edify the Church. The messages delivered to the seven Churches of Asia seem to us undoubtedly to point to something far beyond the limits of those small communities, which were destined speedily to die away. In these, we believe, may be traced the fortunes of the Church in her chief vicissitudes, and a trace of this same purpose seems plainly visible in the Book of the Judges. Dr. Wordsworth appears to have discovered only the such trace, and that our readers will doubtless anticipate was shadowing out of the Papacy in the person of Abimelech. But

this he treats rather under a particular than a general aspect.  subjoin an extract :

"Abimelech, by his Hebrew name, signifies *Father King*. ^{Lev. vii.} ~~Legis-~~mate monarchy itself is a good thing; but that monarchy which ~~God~~ ^{God} forbade, and which set itself up in the place of God, and against God, was an impious thing.

"And CHRIST has forbidden the assumption of supremacy over His Church. He is her Supreme Head, and all His Apostles are brethren: see above, viii. 23, and note on S. Matth. xvi. 18.

"But, notwithstanding this, there has arisen one Person in the Church who usurps lordship over his brethren. There is one Person in His Church who claims such a Supremacy. He will not allow any bishop to be a bishop except by his leave. He will not allow any bishop, who may become an archbishop, to exercise even episcopal functions without his permission, and without suing humbly for the pallium from him. All bishops of CHRIST's Church are to be bishops only 'by grace of the apostolic see,'—as he calls the see of Rome. Thus he claims power not only to *give*, but to *revoke*, all apostolic authority throughout the world. In a word, he has destroyed, as far as in him lies, the life and independence of all episcopal and sacerdotal authority; and he has done this, and still does it, on the plea that he himself is the rock—the foundation-stone of the Church: see S. Matth. xvi. 18.

"What is this, but to make himself another Abimelech? Some might even feel disposed to see a resemblance in the very name *Abimelech*, Father King, Papa-Ré: see viii. 31; ix. 6. Has he not destroyed his brother bishops by his claim to be the *Rock* of the Church? Has he not, as it were, 'slain his brethren,' as Abimelech did, 'on *one stone*?' (see ver. 5.) Has he not also claimed and exercised the power of dethroning Princes, of giving away their dominions, of releasing their subjects from their allegiance? See below, note on Rev. xiii. 13, 14, pp. 233, 234. And does he not set himself up as King of kings in the House of God? Is he not styled, at his coronation in S. Peter's at Rome, 'Pater Regum et Principum, Rector Orbis?' And has he not given countenance to the idolatry of a Baal-berith, and is he not supported thereby? Does he not cause himself to be invested with his usurped powers in the sanctuary of another Shechem? When he is inaugurated as Supreme Pontiff, is he not enthroned on the very Altar of God? Does he not there sit in the temple of God? and are not his feet, which trample on God's altar, kissed by cardinals kneeling before him? See below, on 2 Thess. ii. 2—9, pp. 30—32. This was not done by bishops of Rome in primitive times. No; but in lapse of ages the faithful city became an harlot (Isa. i. 21;) and as the literal Israel became the children of the bondslave by unbelief (Gal. iv. 25,) and as God did not hesitate to describe His own people Israel, when they had fallen way from the pure faith, as 'sons of the sorceress and the seed of the adulteress,' (Isa. lvii. 3,) so likewise the Church of Rome has debased her own origin, her Popes have become Abimelechs, by defection from God."—P. 123.

With this view, which ancient interpreters have also held, of the

history of Abimelech, as being symbolical of the assumptions of Papal Supremacy, we agree on the whole. But we regret to notice, running through Dr. Wordsworth's Annotations, a perpetual effort to see Rome in every kind of spiritual declension referred to in Holy Scripture. It is this which is a drawback to his Commentary as a whole, not only because it imparts a kind of unfairness to his work, but also because, being so absorbed in his one idea, he misses a number of other important significances in that on which he is commenting. The whole of the resemblance, therefore, which he sees between the Book of Judges and the Apocalypse could be summed up in what he evidently considers to be the chief aim and object of the latter, viz., as pointing solely to the defections of the Roman Branch of the Christian Church, rather than to Romanism as a phase. He therefore recognises a kind of undercurrent of anti-Romanism shadowed forth in nearly all the idolatries and sins related of the judges of Israel, as in all the solemn warnings to the seven churches of Asia, he detects Antichrist only under one aspect, viz., that of Rome. A passage from his Introduction will confirm what we say.

"The Apocalypse reveals decline, degeneracy, and downfall in a large part of the Christian Church. It exhibits the abuse of GOD's spiritual gifts; it displays the perversion of those gifts to evil purposes; to the worldly designs of human pride and ambition; to the setting up of the idols of the human will in opposition to the Divine Word; to the glorification of the creature instead of the Creator; in a word, to the aggrandizement of Anti-christianism in the Church of CHRIST. The Apocalypse also reveals the consequences of these principles and practices; it discloses the dissolution and ruin which they will bring on those who abet them; and it also reveals the full and final triumph and exaltation of JESUS CHRIST.

"A similar picture is presented in the Book of Judges.

"It unfolds to the view the defection of Israel after the death of Joshua. It discloses the cause of that defection. The human will struggled against the Divine Will and Word. It craved to be wiser than GOD; to live a life of its own; and to use His gifts for its own grandeur and glory; and it fell a victim to its presumptuous ambition. And GOD displayed His own supremacy even in the punishment of Israel by means of His enemies and theirs: a punishment relieved occasionally by acts of national repentance, and by merciful interventions on the part of GOD, delivering them from their enemies, to whom they enslaved themselves by their sins."—Pp. 75, 76.

We proceed now to endeavour to make good our assertion that, as the fortunes of the whole Church in her various ages and vicissitudes may be traced in the Apocalypse; so, also, the shadow of the same is seen in the Book of the Judges—a dim outline, as it were, of the life of the Church of CHRIST, not of any individual part of the Body, but of the entire Church, at particular seasons, and

under particular phases; for it cannot be that one part, or even member, suffer alone. The whole "spirit of prophecy is the testimony to Jesus," Who, as the Head of His Body, the Church, unites the whole in one indissoluble and spiritual bond, notwithstanding all external hindrances to a full and perfect communion.

But to come now to another Age of the Church, (we cannot, of course, follow any particular order in a short article,) which, we consider, may aptly be said to stand forth in type, under the history of Jephthah and his vow, viz., the age of monasticism. Dr. Wordsworth adopts the opposite, and, we believe we need scarcely say, more popular view, that Jephthah did offer his daughter (*not* against her will) a burnt sacrifice, according to one interpretation of his vow, notwithstanding all the surrounding obstacles and difficulties which arise from the fact that human sacrifices were forbidden by the Levitical Law, and were consequently an abomination to the Jews. The arguments for this opinion are, in Dr. Wordsworth's view, that, (1.) Jephthah lived at a time of great religious degeneracy, and consequently the priesthood had lost its power over the people. (2.) That the children of Israel had fallen into idolatry, and served Baalim and Ashtoreth, and also the gods of Ammon and Moab, who were worshipped with human sacrifices. (3.) That the sacredness of a vow to God was held by Jephthah in such high estimation (Numbers xxx. 2) that notwithstanding all that could be adduced against it in his case, he considered his duty to God demanded its fulfilment. Now it is clear, we think, that this latter view entirely destroys the idea of burnt sacrifice, which is supposed by the two former. For it seems impossible that Jephthah should have regarded his vow to be sacred in a Scriptural sense, and yet have overlooked the fact that human sacrifices were abhorrent to Almighty God.

We can only understand the carrying out of a vow (as a burnt-sacrifice,) from a spirit of *pride* and independence, such as that which influenced Herod; but we cannot conceive that God would permit an act to be done so abhorrent to Himself, in order that it might stand forth as a type of the pure offering of the Incarnate Son. Therefore, though we must admire the skill and reverence with which Dr. Wordsworth has maintained his view of the sacrifice of Jephthah's daughter, we are still compelled to differ from him, and to assert our opinion that there was no sacrifice of life permitted; but a nobler sacrifice, viz., the dedication by the father of his child to a life of perpetual virginity. This to a Jewish maiden would, indeed, be the greatest of all sacrifices, for by it she would be shut out from the hope, which we know filled the breast of every godly woman in Israel, of becoming the mother of the Messiah. According to this view, we believe, may be traced, not only (as we have said,) a typical resemblance between the history of Jephthah and the monastic age of the Chris-

tian Church ; but a far more striking and vivid picture of the pure and sinless life of CHRIST on earth, for which He willingly left His rightful place in the bosom of the Eternal FATHER. He yielded up the glory He had as the SON of GOD, and was content to bear contempt and reproach from men. He accepted His FATHER'S vow.

In support of our opinion, we have first to call attention to the marginal reading, which we find Dr. Wordsworth has almost entirely set aside, regarding it as scarcely worthy of remark. We consider, on the contrary, that the whole question turns upon this point, which, if honestly considered, must entirely upset all the preconceived impressions of a human sacrifice.

But to come to our point. If we turn to the Bible we shall find, we believe, but little difficulty in establishing our statement to the satisfaction of all unprejudiced minds. "And Jephthah vowed a vow unto the LORD, and said, If Thou shalt without fail deliver the children of Ammon into mine hands, then it shall be, that whatsoever cometh forth of the door of my house to meet me, when I return in peace from the children of Ammon, *shall surely be the Lord's*, or (margin,) I will offer it up for a burnt-offering." (Judges xi. 30, 31.)

Is it possible to consider this reading, and not recognize the Almighty wisdom, and the highest inspiration, which put these words into the mouth of the wild and hardy warrior, who, while excited by the desire for a bloody victory, was prevented from incurring the possibility of offering a human victim unto God? Besides too it is unreasonable to suppose that Jephthah could think of manifesting his thankfulness and joy for victory over the children of Ammon, by offering unto the God of Israel an idolatrous sacrifice peculiar to Ammon.

To follow out our argument,—the context, of course upon this view, is easily reconciled. In the 37th and 38th verses of the above chapter it is written : "And she said to her father, Let this thing be done for me : let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains, and bewail my *virginity*, I and my fellows. And he said, Go. And he sent her away for two months : and she went with her companions, and bewailed her *virginity* upon the mountains."

According to both interpretations, she would decidedly lose all chance of becoming a mother in Israel ; but if the cause of her lamentation had been, that she was to be cut off by death, the following assertion would have been without any reason, or point, viz., "And it came to pass at the end of two months that she returned to her father, who did with her according to his vow which he had vowed : *and she knew no man*," (xi. 39,) for it would be to no purpose that this latter assurance is given, if her life had been sacrificed. The words plainly imply something that

took place after the fulfilment of the vow, on the part of Jephthah; that is to say, he dedicated her to the virgin life, and she on her part concurred in that dedication, and never subsequently swerved from it by knowing man.

We have now to mention that there is another marginal reading, which very remarkably confirms the view which we have taken. As the text stands, it is said that "the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite four days in a year," (xi. 40.) This in itself would seem to indicate that she must still have been alive, or they could not have gone to her. But in the margin it is said expressly, that they went "*to talk with her.*" This reading is, of course, conclusive evidence on our side.

We affirm then, that on the principles of interpretation enunciated by Dr. Wordsworth, the history of Jephthah's daughter points most unmistakeably to that most remarkable phase in the history of the Christian Church, the adoption of the celibate life by both sexes, as the great practice of spiritual perfection. If Abimelech may justly be regarded as representing the rise of the Papacy; so, by parity of reasoning, must Jephthah's daughter foreshadow this great development of the Christian life, which dating from Apostolic times, when we have plain indications in Holy Scripture of the existence of "deaconesses," "virgins," and "widows," as forming a religious order of women for the service of the Church; and some fainter indication of a similar order for the other sex, in the mention of the "young men," who were spoken of in the burial of Ananias and Sapphira, and which culminated in the rule of S. Benedict, and has been more influential perhaps, in the history of the Church, than any other institution.

Of the reference made to the subject of Celibacy by Dr. Wordsworth we can only say, it is unworthy an annotator on Holy Scripture; it falls in with that habit that we have before referred to, which renders him unable to see anything in the course of history, but what concerns the corruptions of Rome.

But to come to another, and we think not less striking history, viz. that of Micah's Idolatry. This we consider remarkably prefigures an era in the Church, that promises to be more important and serious than any other. We mean the growth of Protestantism or the Intellectual and Rationalistic Age.

It is difficult to understand how Dr. Wordsworth can fail in recognizing the Protestant Age as shadowed forth in this history, were it not, as we have said, that he can only see one corruption in the course of the Church's history. Let any one take the account of Micah, as it stands in the 17th chapter of Judges, and to the end of the 4th verse of the 18th chapter, and if he admits that tyranny in the Church is represented by Abimelech, surely he must admit that we have spiritual lawlessness here portrayed—the law-

lessness of Protestantism ; which rejects Creeds, Sacraments and Priesthood. The mention of "graven images," however, it seems conveys but one thought to the mind of our commentator, who forgets that idolatry is multiform. The worshipping of dumb idols can in no way *literally* represent any branch of the Church Catholic ; but figuratively it is used in Holy Scripture to represent any sin which draws away the heart from God. But before proceeding to the true interpretation of this passage from the Book of Judges, we would just observe that Dr. Wordsworth does not, to any considerable extent, illustrate the assertion made in his introduction that the Book of Judges bears a typical resemblance to the Apocalypse. The only way in which such a likeness can be shown must certainly be by tracing a fainter shadow in the former of the same type in the latter, which is in the course of fulfilment in the Christian Church generally.

The points which strike us in the passage of Scripture alluded to before are—(1.) The meaning of the name Micah ; (2.) His idolatry ; (3.) The sacrilegious consecration of his own son by himself to the Priesthood, thereby setting aside the Law of God in that matter ; (4.) The condition of Israel that every man did that which was right in his own eyes ; (5.) The second sacrilegious consecration by Micah of the Levite ; (6.) The development of the spirit of independence and rebellion, which leads Micah to think he is safer in his idolatry, because he has made a kind of compromise and has a Levite in his service whom he calls "my priest," saying, "Now know I that the LORD will do me good, seeing I have a Levite to my priest" (xvii. 13,) and the Levite also says (xviii. 4,) "Thus and thus dealeth Micah with me, and hath hired me, and I am his priest."

Have we not here a perfect picture of the disobedience springing from independence and will-worship, which rebelling against authority has led God's people astray, from Cain even to the present day ?

In Micah, whose name signifies "who is like JEHOVAH ?" we have a type of those who, forgetting the closeness of the union between CHRIST and the Church, cast off her authority, and take up with idols, viz. a spurious form of religion of their own devising. Instead of accepting the Ordinances and Sacraments according to the Apostolic model prescribed by CHRIST Himself, we find men content with their own inventions and imitations, or, under the name of humility, ignoring entirely the very office with which they have been invested by the Church.

Thus to the Apostolic priesthood, they say, like Korah of old, "Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every one of them, and the LORD is among them ; wherefore then lift ye up yourselves above the congregation of the LORD ?" (Num. xvi. 3.)

Every man is desirous of "doing that which is right in his own eyes." Seeing that all Christians are holy, they would take also upon themselves the priesthood, without reference to God's appointment or authority, which they refuse to acknowledge, and follow Micah who consecrated his own son.

More striking still is the shadow cast forward by the satisfaction of Micah when he meets with the Levite. For how do the enemies of the Church rejoice when one of apostolic descent consents to unite in schismatical meetings and worship: one who not caring to be a priest of the Most High, becomes the head of a party to which office he is appointed not by God, but by human authority only. Thus a kind of insidious compromise is often made by men between their own consciences and pride, who fearing entirely to throw off the authority of the Church, yet wish to do that which is right in their own eyes. And by this means they endeavour to salve over their consciences, saying with Micah, "Now *know* I that the LORD will do *me* good, seeing I have a *Levite to my priest*." Such is the case with Wesleyans and others.

They say to the Church, "We have not forsaken you; Wesley, our founder, was a priest. He had no desire to leave the Church, and we follow him, therefore we cannot be wrong. Ye take too much upon you, seeing all the congregation are holy, every *one of them*."

We cannot here carry out our opinion further, but we feel sure that the proud and rebellious condition of Israel in the days of Micah, points most clearly to the age of rationalistic self-confidence, in which each man trusting to his own reason and intellect does that which appears right in his own eyes, and finding the undeviating authority of the Church a constraint upon his wishes and actions, he casts it off altogether to follow his own judgment.

We must bring this article to a close by simply saying that Dr. Wordsworth in commenting upon the history of Samson, as a type of CHRIST, our spiritual Samson, has, with his usual reverence for Holy Scripture, and the scriptural discernment for which he is so remarkable, done more than any other to remove the tone of irreverence with which this and many other histories in the Bible are regarded by ordinary readers.

Had we space, we think we could also trace the shadow of another age in the Church of CHRIST, viz., that of Mediæval chivalry, when men were, in many respects, good, and gentle, and holy, but oftentimes a wild and daring spirit, grotesque and inconsistent to the last degree, gained the ascendancy, and landed its professors in sensualism. There was no lack of physical or moral courage combined, nevertheless, with great weakness. And this is the picture of Samson.

In Jael's history also, we think could be found a resemblance to the career of Mahomet. He, though an alien to the Church,

came practically to her assistance and swept away that mass of heresies which threatened to undermine her life, and so aroused the Church to a sense of the danger into which she had fallen. Jael, the heathen, delivered God's people from their enemies.

The act of Jael viewed naturally must certainly be admitted to have something of fraud and treachery in it, and so no one can doubt that it was by reason of the studied resemblance of his religion in many particulars to Christianity, that the false prophet succeeded in drawing away so many after him, who yet had been nurtured in the bosom of the Church.¹

Space will not allow us to draw out this analogy at length, nor would there be any purpose in so doing. Our object has been simply to indicate that the idea put forward by Dr. Wordsworth contains a much larger amount of truth in it than he seems to be aware of, and that it would be quite easy to show that the lives of the judges which seem to be recorded in such a very promiscuous manner, have this much of method in them that they point to some of the varying phases of the Spirit's working in the Church, and of some of the different ways in which men have abused the gifts and counterworked His will; while nevertheless His hand is over all, and He brings good out of evil, and makes even sinful men instruments of effecting His purposes.

DAN JOHN GAYTRIGGE, THE PARISH PRIEST OF THE FOURTEENTH CENTURY.

WERE the clergy in the middle ages as ignorant and as inefficient as it pleases many modern writers to represent them? Is it true that all the preaching was confined to the friars, and that the parsons and vicars were mere "mass-johns" or else entirely employed in secular pursuits as stewards, tax-gatherers, attorneys, bailiffs? Perhaps the modern estimate may have caught the main features of the time, but certainly it is not a fair one if it be extended generally. The more that the manuscript stores of old English writing are ransacked, the more does it appear that the mediæval divine was by no means the ignoramus he is usually set down to be. Neither was he without the power of preaching, and of preaching simply, powerfully, scripturally. The scholastic theology which is assumed by many to have been altogether unedifying, was chiefly confined to the Universities, not penetrating into the country parishes

¹ It is remarkable that in the Apocalypse also Mahomet is prefigured by a woman—"the woman Jezebel," who was also a heathen. See Chamberlain's "Seven Ages of the Church."

of the land. The vast edifice of superstition reared upon the debt to the Blessed Virgin was also the work of the friars. These educated and exceedingly disagreeable mendicants invaded the of the country parson, vilipended him to his flock, got hold of rich sinners in his congregation at the confessional, mount pulpit and preached the fashionable theology, and then having turbed everything and secured a good spoil, went away and with scorn of the ignorance and rusticity of the secular. The friars had the ear of the world for some centuries, and it therefore to be wondered at if an exceedingly low value had ordinarily put upon the parish priests whom they treated with scant respect. Certainly, the contempt which they felt expressed was repaid in kind. Invectives against the friars have been said to be rare, the whole of mediæval literature teeming with them, from the time when Bishop Grosseteste on their first introduction into England was obliged to threaten his clergy with severest punishments for trying to hinder their preaching, down to that of the author of *Piers Plowman*, two hundred and fifty years afterwards, when the four Orders could find but few good men to say a word for them. It was doubtless a very pretty quality but the friars had by far the best of it, partly by reason of greater skill in speaking and writing, but chiefly by the tremendous influence of Rome, which was thrown unreservedly into their scale. As a rule it may be said that the mediæval parish priest in England did not love the Pope. He had to pay him a good deal of money, and he got very little from him in return. He allowed the chance of a few of the worst benefices, but the better ones were reserved for the Italians. There was a time in England when a bull ordained that no patron should present any benefice until a certain number of Italians were first presented for. These gentlemen never visited the places of which they were the "cure of souls." The bishops, too, were courtiers and sycophants, judges or generals, as the case might be. Certain English parish priests in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries were an ill-used man. Derided and traduced by the friar, and pillaged by the Pope, neglected by those who had good things to bestow, and often treated in the most tyrannical fashion by the bishop, it is scarcely fair to expect of him much development parochially or in the way of literature. Yet if we investigate his characteristics fairly, he will perhaps not turn out so bad as might have thought. Certainly one thing we will understand. He will be found to have known a great deal more of the world than a divine of the eighteenth century. He will not be a very profound reasoner, but he will be a very practical man. His discourse may be dry, but it will be very much to the point. He may insist on seven Sacraments and ignore the second commandment, but that is better than never men-

Sacraments at all, and refining away all the ten commandments. But we desire to let our fourteenth century friend speak for himself. We have selected a manuscript sermon of the period, which we think fairly illustrates what a country parson might and did preach to his flock. Let our readers judge. Here are none of the clever syllogisms of the scholastic nor the ecstasies of the mystic, but there is some very plain straightforward sort of teaching. We are sorry that we cannot give any account of the author. Who Dan John Gaytrigge was, or even where he lived and preached we are unable to inform the reader. That he was a north-countryman his language will show. He was probably none the worse parson for that. But whatever we may think of his theology we must needs admire his English. It is eminently terse and racy. He begins without a text.

“ Als a grett doctour schewes in his buke, of all the creatours that GOD made in Hevene and in erthe, in water and in ayere, or in oghte elles, the soverayne cause and the skill why He made thame was His awen gud wille and His gudness, thurgh the whilke gudnes als He es all gude, He walde that some creatures of thase that He made ware communers of that blyse that ever mare lastis. And for that na creatoure myghte come to that blysse with-owtten knawynge of GOD, als that clerkes teches, He made skillwyse creatours, angelle and man, of witt and wysdom to knawe GOD Almyghtyne, and thorowe thaire knawynge lufe Hym and serve Hym, and so come to that blyse that thay ware made to. This manere of knawynge had our forme-fadyrs in the state of innocence that thay ware made in, and so sulde we hafe hade it if thay had noghte synned. Noghte so mekill als hally saules hase now in Hevene, bot mekill mare than mane hase now in erthe. For oure fourme-fadyrs synned, sayse the prophete, and we bere the wykkydnes of thaire mysdedis, for the knawynge that thay had of GOD Almyghtene thay had it of GODDES gyfte at thaire begynnyng, with-owtten trauayle, or tray, or passinge of tym. And all the knawynge that we hafe in this werlde of Hym es of heryng and leryng and techyng of other, of the law and the lare that langes till Haly Kirke, the whilke all creatours that lufes GOD Almyghtene awe to knawe and to cun, and lede thaire lyfe aftere, and swa come to that blysse that never mare blynes. And forthi that mekill folke now in this werlde ne ere noghte well ynoghe lerede to knawe GOD Almyghty, ne lufe Hym, ne serve Hym als thay sulde do, and als thaire dedys oftesythes opynly schewes in gret perell to thame to lyfe and to saule, and perawnter the defeaute may be in them that have thaire saules for to kepe, and thaym sulde techen, als prelates and persones, vicars and prestes that ere hal-dene by dett for to lere thame—forthi, oure fadere the byschope, that GOD Almyghty save, that, als sayne Paule sayse in his pystill, will that all mene be safe and knawe GOD Almyghtene, and namely thare undir-lowtts that till him langes,¹ have tretide and ordaynede for the comone profett, thorowe the counsell of his clergy, that ilkane that undire hym hase cure of saule, opynly one Ynglysche apone Sonondayes, preche

¹ Especially those under him who more peculiarly belong to him.

and teche thaym that thay hase cure of the lawe and the lare to knawe God Almyghty."

This introduction certainly gives us to understand that the practice of preaching to the people in the vulgar tongue was not quite so common a one in the days of Dan John Gaytrigge as it is in our own. But then it must be remembered that the mediæval parish priest had no idea of the oratory of display. He did not dream of preaching what is called a fine sermon; he did not care to aim at the mellifluous style, the well turned sentence, the carefully polished apothegm. His notion of a sermon was simply an instruction, and as this instruction might be given in other ways than by a sermon, he did not hold the vital necessity of continual sermons. There might however be too little as well as too much, and accordingly "our holy fadyr the byschope" had decided that there should be a course of sermons throughout his diocese preached every Sunday in English. Desirous however that there should be no erratic oratory or vain and useless discussions, he had not only desired his clergy to preach, but had also told them what to preach about.

"Principally they were to schew these sex thynges, the fourtene poyntes that fallis to the trouthe,—the ten commandementes that Gon hase gyfene us,—the sevene Sacramentes that er in Haly Kyrke,—the sevene werkes of mercy untill our euene cristyne,—the sevene vertus that ilke mane sall use,—the sevene dedly synnes that ilke man sall refuse. And he byddes and commandes in all that he may that all that hase cure and kepyng undire hym, emoyve thaire parischenes and thaire suggettes, that thay here and lere thise ilke sex thynges and oftesythes reherse tham till that thay cune thame, and sythene teche thame thaire childere if thay any have, whate tyme so thay are of elde to lere thame. And that perssonns, and vycars, and all parische prestis, enquere delygently of thaire suggettes in the Lentyne tym, when thay come to scryfte, whether thay knawe and cun thise sex thynges, and if it be fundene that they cune tham noghte, that thay enjoyne tham apone his behalfe and of payne of penance for to cune thame. And for-thi that nane sall excuse thaym thurghe unknowlechyng for to cune tham, oure haly fadir the Beschope of his gudnes hase ordayned and bedyne that thay be schewede opynly one Ynglysche emanges the folke."

Certainly in these days we have not this simple and effective means of enforcing attention to sermons. If it were so, perhaps we might think less of graces of oratory, and confine ourselves more to simple teaching. Having given this introductory sketch of the reason and object of his discourse, the worthy Dan John proceeds at once to treat the topics seriatim. And first of the Articles of "the trouthe," or faith.

"Als gret clerkes teches and schewes in thaire bukes thare falles to the faythe fourtene poyntes, of the whilke sevene falles to GODDES

Goddhede, and other sevene falles to CRISTES manhede. The firste poynte that we sall trowe of the Godhede es to trow stedfastly in a¹ trewe GODD, and that na nother es for to trowe in. The tother² es that the highe Fadir of Hevene es stedfaste and sothefaste GODD Almyghtene. The thirde es that JHESUS CRISTE GODDES SONE of Hevene is sothefastly GODE euen till His Fadir. The ferthe es that the HALY GASTE that samenly comes of bathe the FADIR and the SONE es sothefaste GODE euen to thaym bathe."

Having thus enunciated the orthodox faith in the Trinity, the preacher goes on through the other heads of the faith. The language in which they are put forth is very simple and striking. Thus the Article of the Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints, is explained as

"Haly Kirke, oure modere, es hallyly ane thorow owte the werlde, that es, comonyng and felawrede of all Cristene folke that commons togedire in the Sacramentes and in other haly thynges that falles till Haly Kyrke with-owthene of whilke ne es na saule hele."

Very beautifully is the Incarnation described as

"JHESU CRISTE GODDES SONE of Hevene, sothefastly conceived of he madene Marie tuke flesche and blude and become mane thurgh he myghte and the strenghe of the HALY GASTE, with-owthen any merryng of hir modirhede, withowthene any mynyng of hir maydenhede."

We sadly miss these fine old English words now. The passion of our Blessed LORD can hardly be put in more touching language than this,

"We sall trowe CRISTES passione that He tholede bodyly for synfull man-kynde, how He was betraysede with His disciple and taken with the Jewes, beten with scourges that na skynne helde, naylede one the rude and corounde with thornes, and many other hard paynes, and drede at the laste. And when He was dede, and His body tane doune and wondene and dolvene, zit the whills His body lay in the grave, the gaste with the Godhede wente unto Helle and beryede it, and tuke owte thase that ware thare-in als Adam and Eve and other forme-fadyrs whilke He in His forluke walde that ware savede."

The "heryng" or harrowing of Hell is a favourite topic with the mediæval theologian, and there is an old English poem with this title. Equally striking are the words which describe the Ascension.

"He steye in-till Hevene, whare oure kynde es now in His blyssed personne, noghte ancy even ne mete till His angells; bot heghe coround kynghe abowne all His angells that before tyme was lesse the kynde of angells."

¹ One.

² Second.

Concerning the Judgment it is said that He shall come

"bathe for to deme the qwykke and the dede, whare all the folke that ever was or es or sall be, sall sothefastly be schewede and sene before Hym, and ilke a man answere of his awen dedis and be saved or dampnede whether so he serves, for als His ryghtwysenes now es mengede¹ with mercy, swa sall it thane be withowttene mercy."

From the Creed the preacher passes to the Commandments ; the first of which, as he tells us, "charges us and teches us that we leve ne lowte na false goddes," and forbids "alkyn misbelevs and all mawmetryes,"² as well as charms and witchcraft. The second commandment of the Decalogue is as usual omitted, and here

"the tother commandment byddes us noghte take in ydylchippene i-vayne the name of oure LORDE GODD, so that we trowe noghte in Hi name bot that es sothefaste, that we swere noghte in His name, bot be byhovely, and that we neuene noghte His name bot wirchipfully."

The fourth commandment of the Decalogue is thus given.

"That we halde and halowe oure haly day the Sonondaye, and other that falles in the zere that er ordeynede to halowe thurgh Hal Kyrke ; in the whilke dayes all folke bathe lerede and lawede³ awe t-gyffe tham gudly to GODDES service to here and saye it efter thair state es, in wirchipe of GOD Almighty and of His gud halowes."

The fourth commandment (fifth) is said to teach not only reverence and care for our fleshly father and mother, but also for

"our gastely fadire that hase hevede⁴ of us and teches us to lyffe ti-hele of our saules, and till our gastely modyr, that es Haly Kyrke, t-be bouxome thareto and save the ryghte of it, for it es modir till all the cristenly lyffes."

In order to make out the required number of ten for the Commandments when the second is omitted, the tenth is divided into two parts by somewhat an arbitrary distinction. The ninth is said to forbid all

"wrangwyse covetyse of land or of lythe, or of oghte elles that may noghte be lyftede ne raysede fra the grounde, als thyunge that es stedfaste and may noghte be styrrede."

while the tenth forbids us

"to zerne⁵ or to take anything that may be styrride of other men's gudes, als robes, or reches, or other catell."

From the Commandments the preacher passes on to the Seven Sacraments,

¹ Mingled.

² Worshipping of images, from Mawmet or Mammet, a puppet, or image.

³ Lewd, ignorant, untaught.

⁴ Head, or oversight.

⁵ Desire, or covet

"Of whilke sevene the firste fyve ilke cristene man awe lawefully to take efter his elde es."¹

Confirmation is said to make those who receive it

"more stallworthe than thay ware before to stande agaynes the fende and dedly syne."

The definition of repentance is good.

"Sothefaste for-thynkyng that we hafe of our syne with-owttene will or thoghte to turn agayne to it."

The Sacrament of the Altar we are told

"ilke mane and womane that of elde es awe for to rescheyve anes in the zere, that es at say at the Pasch, als Haly Kyrke uses, when thay ere elensed of syne thurgh penance, on payne of doynge owte of Haly Kyrke."

Extreme unction

"awe anely for to be gyffene to tham that the prest wate ere of skillwyse elde, and that be sese sekyrly in perelle of dede, in lyghtenes and alegance of thaire sekenes, if GODDE wille that thay turne agayne to the hele, and als in forgyffnes of venial synnes, and in lessyng of payne if thay passe hethene."²

"The ferthe thyng of the sex to kawe GODD Almyghty that vs byhoues fulfille in alle that we maye, ere the seuene dedis of mercy vntilloure euene cristene, that GODD sall reherse vs upon the dredfulle day of dome and wict howe we have done tham here in this lyfe, als Sayne Mathewe makes mynde in his Gospelle. . . . The fyfte es to be thole-mode when men mysdoes vs. The sevend when men askes vs for to lere thaym, if we cune mare than thay for to lere thayme. Thise vntilloure neghtebours ere full nedfull, and to thame that duse thayme wondire medfulle, for he sall mercy that mercyfull es, and man with-owttene mercy of mercy sall mysse."

Then follow the seven virtues,

"of whilke seuene the thre firste that ere hede thewes teches³ vs how to hafe vs vnto GODD Almyghty, and the foure teches vs swa to lyffe that it be bathe lykande to GODD and to mane."

The description of hope is very striking,

"a sekyre habydynge of gastely gude thurgh GODDES gudnes andoure gude dedis for to come to that blysse that never mare blynnys,⁴ noghte anely in trayste of GODDES gudnes, ne allanly in trayste ofoure gude dedis, bot in trayste of thaym bathe, whene thay are bathe samene, for nother sall we fall sa ferre in-till whan hope that we ne sall noghte com to hafe that blysse if we well do, ne we sall noghte com so ferre in-to overhope, for to trayste sa mekill in GODDES gudnes that we sall hope to have that blysse with-owttene gude dedys."

¹ According to his age, or when his age permits.

² Hence.

³ Chief virtues.

⁴ Ceases.

Some of the virtues would not now be recognised under their old names. For instance, Prudence is "Sleghte or slegheues that wysses vs to be warre with wathes¹ of the werlde." Temperance is "methe or methefulnes that kepes vs fra owterage and haldes vs in everhede."

The last topic touched in the sermon is the seven "hevede" or deadly sins. "The wyese man byddes in his buke, als fra the face of the neddyre fande to flee syne." Pride is

"a lykande heghenes of a man's herte and of this wikkede synne comes some sere spyces,² boste and avauntynge, and vnboundomnes, despyte and ypocrisy and unhamlynes. . . . The secunde dedly synne es hattene envy of whilke many spyces sprenges. . . . The thyrd hevede es wrethe, that es a wykkede stirrynge or bolleuyng of herte, wherefore a man wilnes for to wreke hyme or wykkedly to venge hyme appone his eyn cristyne. . . . The ferthe dedly synne mene calles glotinge, that es ane vnskillwyse lykyng or lufe in taste or in takynge of mete or of drynke."

One of the ways in which this sin may be committed is eating either too early or too late. This refers to the custom of indulging in what were called "rere-suppers" on the evenings of fast days, and thus unduly fortifying the inner man against the fast which was to follow, and also to the habit of dining before mass. Covetousness is

"a wrangwyse zernyng to have any maner of gude that vs awe noghte, . . . als be sacrelege or by symony, falsehede, or okyr,³ or other gelery,⁴ whilk these wordly mene er wounte for to vse, that castes thaire covaundnes⁵ swa vnto covetyse, that thay ne rekke whether it be with ryghte or with wrange, bot that they may gette that at⁶ thair herte zernes.⁷ . . . The sexte dedly synne is slewthe or slawenes, that es a hertly angere or anoye till vs of any gastely gud that we sall d and of this wykkede synn comes sere spyces. Ane es latesomnes lyte, to drawe apone lenghte or to lache any gude dedis that we sall that may turne vs till helpe or hele of our saules, another es a dullne or hevenes of herte that lettes vs for to lufe oure LORDE GODE A myghtene or any likynge to hafe in His servyse. The thirde es ydyl chip that over mekill es hauntede, that makes lathe to begynne any gude dedis and lightly does vs to leve tham whan oghte es begune, and enemy to Cristene mane saule, stepmodire and stamerynge agayne gude thewes, and witter-wyssynge⁸ and waye till all vyces. . . . This ere the sex thynges that I hafe spoken off that the lawe of Haly Kyrk lyes maste in, the whilke we ere halden to knawe and to cun, if we sal knawe GOD Almyghty and come till His blysse. And for to gyffe zow better wyll for to cune thaym oure fadir the beschope grauntes of his grace fourty dayes of perdonn till all that cunes thaym, and ratyfyce alsua that other men gyffes, swa mekill covettes he the hele of zow saules, for zife ze covandly knawe thise sex thynges, thurgh thaym sal

¹ Goods.² Various sorts.³ Usury.⁴ Cheating.⁵ Skill.⁶ Which.⁷ Desires.⁸ Teacher.

se cune knawe GODD Almyghty, whaym, als Sayne John sayse in his Gospelle, covandely for to knawe swylke als he es, endles lyfe and lastande blysse, to the whylke blysse he brynge vs oure LORDE GODD Almyghty."

Such is a fair specimen of a mediæval sermon, and if the great end and object of a sermon be instruction, and one absolute requirement of it be simplicity, it may be pronounced not a very bad fulfilment of these conditions. In this sermon there is no Mariolatry, nothing of images, saints or relics, no directions for going on pilgrimage, nor even any order for saying a certain number of Aves and Pater Nosters for the soul's health. The great truths of the Creed and Commandments are put forth, together with the main points of a Christian life, and it may fairly be said that no parishioner of Dan John Gaytrigge who made himself fully up in this short summary of instruction as his pastor bid him, would be in that complete state of ignorance and darkness in which it pleases many to represent the men of this period. The educational standard here proposed may not be a very high one, although we find that it had somewhat advanced over that of the thirteenth century. In Bishop Grosseteste's constitutions it is directed that every child should be taught the LORD's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ave Maria, and how to make the sign of the cross.¹ Even this, with all our schools and efforts for education, is more than can be truly said of every child in the nineteenth century. Witness the startling revelations made before the Commissioners for taking evidence as to children's labour. But the standard of Dan John's Bishop is not only higher than Bishop Grosseteste's, but is also higher than that proposed by our own Church for Confirmation,—“the Creed, the LORD's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments in the vulgar tongue.” Certainly therefore it does say something for the mediæval Church that this should have been proposed and insisted on.

BUCKLER ON THE RESTORATION OF LINCOLN CATHEDRAL.

A Description and Defence of the Restoration of the Exterior of Lincoln Cathedral, with a comparative Examination of the Restorations of other Cathedrals and Parish Churches, &c. By J. C. BUCKLER, Architect. Rivingtons, Oxford and London.

If the two preceding centuries will be ever marked in the page of history as the ages of church destruction and of disfigurement, we may boldly predict that the present century will stand out in

¹ Pegge's Grosseteste, p. 316.

marked contrast as the age of restoration. Indeed so universal is the rage for restoration, that in many cases the work has been hastily and injudiciously done, and irreparable damage committed. There seems to be, in many quarters, a want of principle in the management of the restorations, a sort of eclecticism on the part of the architect, as if you saw him reproducing himself in all his works. Some perhaps are enamoured of one particular style, and they will try to restore all their churches in it; others strain after the effect of making an old church look entirely new. This last is especially the vice of contractors and their workmen, whose great ambition seems to be to make all things look neat, trim, uniform. There is, no doubt, great temptation to do this,—a new stone in the midst of old ones, a freshly cut portion in the midst of old, and perhaps partially decayed mouldings, have a patched and incongruous look, which distresses the eye, and gives the impression of slovenly and unfinished workmanship, which neither architect nor mason likes to leave.

Our great architects and church restorers have with one voice cried out for retaining as much of the old as possible; they say, Don't touch any stone not absolutely decayed, never mind the incongruous look of a new piece in the midst of old; time, which has mellowed the one, will also mellow the other; don't be ashamed to let the world see that we have too much respect for our ancestors to destroy their work for the sake of showing off our own. Mr. G. G. Scott writes thus:

“When church restoration commenced many years back, the word was conventionally understood to mean the removal of the ancient surface, and the bringing the building back to the appearance of a new structure. Even then, however, this process was occasionally protested against. Carter, about the year 1800, describes it as ‘either receiving a new fangled dress, or *falling beneath the workman's hands into undistinguished dust.*’ I take the liberty of copying some published remarks of my own on this point which may explain my meaning. ‘An original detail, (especially in carving,) though partially decayed or mutilated, is infinitely more valuable than the most skilful attempt at restoration. A decayed or broken capital, or bas-relief, retains a beauty and an interest which can never attach to a perfected copy; and it is much better as a general rule to leave such fragments of art to tell their own story, which they will do with immeasurably greater truthfulness without our aid. Restorers, even when disposed to be conservative, often mistake the true meaning and object of restoration, which is not to make a building look as if it were new, but (so far as concerns the fabric) to put it in seemly repair, to replace features which have been actually destroyed by modern imitations, *where they can be indisputably traced*, to clean the ancient surface from modern overlaying, and to check the progress of decay and dilapidation. The more of the ancient material, and *the ancient surface remain*, the less new introduced, the more successful the restoration. If more cannot

be saved, even one or two old bemossed stones, in a window or in a cornice, give value and truthfulness to the work, but where it is possible, *all, or the great majority* of the old stones should retain their *untouched and unsmartened surface*; and even when a wall is of necessity taken down, it is often possible, and would be always desirable to rebuild it *stone by stone*. There is an individual character even in the old ashlar which should not be overlooked.' ”

The above extract is taken from a letter addressed by Mr. Scott to the Dean of Lincoln in 1859, on the received information that a process of restoration was going on at the cathedral, in which a wholesale destruction of old carvings, and insertion of new ones, as well as a regular chipping and scraping of others, formed a considerable feature. Mr. Scott writes strongly,—“*I beg of you to excuse my expressing to you my—I can truly say—grief and agitation* at hearing of this, and my entreating you to pause, &c. &c.” In consequence of this letter, and of the repeating last year in the public prints that this kind of work was going on at Lincoln, Mr. Buckler, the architect in whose hands the restoration of the cathedral is placed, publishes the work which stands at the head of this article, a large volume of 286 pages. In this book he vindicates the work of restoration that has been carried on at Lincoln, shows that the utmost care has been taken to carry out the restoration on the principle laid down by Mr. Scott,—that no single stone has been unnecessarily removed, that no “chipping and scraping” of the carved work has been practised, and that throughout the whole the work has been of a thoroughly conservative character.

Mr. Buckler, however, is by no means content with a mere defence of his own work against the accusations of Mr. Scott, he turns round and charges the latter with perpetrating himself the very faults which he condemns in others.

“First shall be mentioned the exquisite front of the chapel on Wakefield Bridge. It was a gem of the fourteenth century. . . . Part of the front which escaped the waves of the Calder, was rescued for the ornamentation of a garden! What became of Mr. G. G. Scott’s obedience to his own laws?

“The front of this chapel presented rich and delicate patterns of reticulated tracery and diaper, with much peculiarity of detail and construction. The ordinary rules of jointing had been laid aside: arches, tracery, crocketed gablets, the vertical panels were all wrought in single blocks of stone. Never, perhaps, in a building exposed to the weather, was so great a diversity of panelled and sculptured embellishment associated with so few joinings; and, perhaps, material of no other quality than the one employed would, after the lapse of four centuries, have retained such indubitable remains of the gem-like workmanship, so exquisitely executed. Where now is all this beauty? The whole front was ruthlessly hurled down, and the material employed in its re-construction gave early indication of untimely relapse into worse ruin.

"The grand tower of Doncaster church was not hastily condemned; it was reserved among the surrounding ruins for preservation every antiquary in the kingdom heard, and for a long time before its pardon was ensured. Its strength for duration was ascertained, and yet it was thrown down by one who mourns inconsolably on the fable that a few feet of the ancient stonework of Lincoln Cathedral had been 'scraped.'"—P. 32.

The other vice of restorers here mentioned, is that of restoring to one style an ancient church, built at different times, and sometimes the addition in the style of the period when the addition was made. Mr. Buckler charges Mr. Scott with perpetrating this also.

"At Stafford, in place of gables, the walls of the nave and transept were in the fifteenth century, carried up squared and embattled, forming in a remarkably handsome clerestory, adorned with pinnacles on the exterior, with a worthy timber roof within. . . . Determined however, to prove that he is not obliged to obey the laws which history makes and propounds, Mr. Scott sweeps away the clerestory on the south wing of the transept, and builds up a gable in defiance of its own declaration, that '*the more of the ancient material and the more of the surface remains, and the less new introduced, the more successful the restoration.*'"

"Our churches are mostly assemblages of miscellaneous architecture, the greater part combined upon Norman foundations, or Norman and arcades. These are the means by which we become possessed of so many choice specimens of different ages. A whole church in one style is of rare occurrence, when we meet with an instance so highly appreciated; but an injury is done to the history of architecture by reducing churches of various styles to this condition. The assemblage they present is invaluable, the diversity instructive; but the appearance of a church modernised after this fashion is tame, and devoid of the worth which it possessed by the successive improvements of antiquity."—P. 46.

We are not going to decide on this point of dispute between these two architects. Mr. Scott is, no doubt, quite competent to defend himself; but it is of very great importance to bring these subjects before the public. Every one is apt to be carried away by the mere sound of a great name; and as history tells us of the crimes perpetrated under the name of liberty, so will history be able to record the wholesale destruction carried on under the name of restoration.

There is one point, however, which we do think ourselves competent to speak on, even before the first architects, and that is the ritual arrangements of the chancel. How often we have been pointed in witnessing some fine old church well restored, both outside and in, till we come to the chancel: there we find stalls prepared for priests and choir, but the altar arrangements most objectionable.

able ; in some cases rendering it impossible to carry out the rubrical directions of the Church. In fact, with most architects, the altar is the last thing thought of. Font, pulpit, lectern, stalls, are generally well looked after, and provided. Last of all comes the Holy place, where the highest mysteries are to be celebrated ; and there is set a low, mean table, with no provision for cross, candlesticks, &c. Very often no credence, no piscina ; quite as often we see a handsome painted window, and a paltry altar-cloth ; elaborate and costly carving, and inferior altar vessels. If architects really felt the importance of their office as church restorers, if they were impressed with the idea that they are appointed to restore a church, in order that the worship of God may be duly celebrated, and not that they are merely repairing an ancient building, as they would a town-hall, or an old castle, we should have the chancel and the altar arrangements made first ; the cost of all necessary for it provided, before one thought was cast on any other part, we should not have to complain of so many grievous failures, or so many half-finished restorations.

The *Ecclesiologist*, we perceive, takes entirely the side of Mr. Scott ; but we hardly think our contemporary is quite free from professional partisanship, and neither the Chapter nor Bishop of Lincoln, it must be admitted, bear a very good name.

SCYLLA AND CHARYBDIS.

1. *Thoughts on Religion and the Bible.* By a Layman. London ; Trübner and Co.
2. *Tekel. The Views of a Church of England Layman relative to the Church of England Clergy, with some Suggestions on the subject of Lay Agency.* London : Macintosh.

THE contrast afforded by these two pamphlets deserves attention. Separately they are worthless, but considered as a contrast of the two different schools,—the Broad Church and the Low,—and triumphantly refuting one another, they may be regarded very much in the light of the Kilkenny cats. Each destroys its opponent.

The writer of "Thoughts on Religion and the Bible," commences by the hackneyed charge against the sacred writings that they are inconsistent with the more recent discoveries of science. Science rests upon proof, religion upon dogma. There can be no dogma without infallibility, but admitting that it is the traditional belief of millions, that infallible authority exists, he thus proceeds :

"Where this authority exists there are different opinions. Amongst Christian nations these opinions may be divided into three : first, that

which places infallible authority in the Pope; secondly, that which places it in the general opinions of Christians expressed by a majority of Bishops assembled in a general council; and, thirdly, the Protestant opinion which places it in the Bible."

The first two opinions are in his judgment so self-evidently absurd as to need no refutation; the error is too transparent, so he devotes himself to the last only. Happily in the present day all Catholics are well aware, that however intrinsically valuable the Bible may be, it is neither the foundation nor the code of the faith. It may be shown to be inaccurate, to be faulty; it may be replete with mistranscriptions and mistranslations, but neither faults of the one character nor the other can in any way injure a faith which exists outside it, and which might have existed just as well if nine-tenths of it had never been preserved. This we state merely in passing, in order to clear away any misconception as to our meaning, at the same time fully recognizing the importance of the Bible as a handmaid to the Christian faith. In this capacity the Catholic Church, by whose assiduity it was rescued from the confusion of the earlier centuries, who collated it from among the many spurious writings of that period, and finally impressed it with the imprimatur of her own authority, is very jealous of the insidious efforts to undermine its influence, first by mistaking the character of the narrative, and then by drawing conclusions as to its truth in very much the same spirit as if it were a treatise on astronomy or geology. The writer labours through several pages to show that no authentic manuscript remains of a sufficiently early date to give an even reasonable chance of verbal accuracy. Now let this be granted. Let us assume that there are verbal errors in the book, that there are interpolations and elisions. Grant it, but what does it matter? If the Bible were what Protestants pretend it to be, at once a history and a creed, then indeed the absence of such evidence of absolute verbal authenticity would be fatal to any system of faith founded upon it, and upon it only. Supposing there were any doubt as to the authenticity of some of the paragraphs in our creeds: such a doubt would be fatal to the entire faith. Take as an example the clause in the Athanasian Creed which declares the two natures of our Lord, and suppose it could be said, "There is considerable doubt as to the accuracy of this clause," what would become of this most important element in our faith, and of all the consequents which follow from it? But such a doubt may exist as to many verses, and some of them the most important in the Bible, without giving the Catholic mind one instant of doubt or anxiety. The substantiation of one single such inaccuracy is fatal to the Protestant theory which rests on the Bible and the Bible only. Hence in Germany and other Protestant countries, where men really think fairly and are not afraid of the

results of their speculations, a great majority are Deists and Atheists, and a large section of the English Church, both lay and cleric, are rapidly becoming so, only, in deference to the religious character of the English mind, they veil their views in ambiguous phraseology, and try and content themselves with a subjective morality instead of an objective faith.

The writer's views are a fair sample.

"If we are asked, 'The Bible not being infallible, how can we know what is true and what is not true in it?' we answer,—we must separate the true from the false in the Bible by the same process as in any other book."

Quot homines tot sententiæ. Unfortunately, we shall have as many interpretations as interpreters. The very next paragraph is an instance.

"All truths may be divided into two classes according to the evidence on which we receive them; viz., mental truths and phænomena, (or every event which takes place;) mental truths may be subdivided into intellectual and moral."

Hamilton in his *Metaphysics* gives the following tabular view of philosophy:

Mind or Consciousness affords	{	Facts, phænomenology .	Cognitions.
		Empirical psychology .	Feelings.
	{		Conative powers.
			(Will and Desire.)
	{	Laws, nomology . . .	Cognitions.
		Rational psychology .	Logic.
{	{		Feelings, Æsthetic.
			Conative powers.
			Moral philosophy.
			Political philosophy.
{	{	Results, ontology . . .	Being of God.
		Inferential psychology .	Immortality of the soul, &c.

The division into mental truths and phænomena, by the writer of "Thoughts on Religion," is simple nonsense: it is like dividing a flock of sheep into sheep with tails and sheep with four legs. The whole flock would correspond with each division. So mental truths and phænomena: it is a mental truth that injury produces anger, but it is also part of the phænomena of the mind, and included under empirical psychology. In all probability, what the writer wishes to express is, that mental truths correspond with ontology; but if so, what becomes of the third division, the inferences, such as the immortality of the soul?

The writer continues the tangle as follows: "All the evidence on

which we receive mental truths is ultimately resolvable into that of a voice within us whose testimony we are so formed we must accept. For example, when it is stated a part is less than a whole, our intellectual faculties bear witness that it is true." Now unfortunately philosophers are considerably in doubt as to the doctrine of innate ideas. John Stuart Mill, the great apostle of liberal Deism, denies that there is any mental recognition of these truths, but assumes that we know that two and two make four simply from experience. Hamilton only gives the being of God, and the immortality of the soul, as the inferences to be drawn from the phenomena of the mind.

So, then, the writer having successfully disposed of the Bible Christianity, and passed over Catholic Christianity as unworthy even of refutation, proceeds to lay down his own theory, basing it on one of the most occult questions of philosophy, and one on which scarcely any two philosophers actually agree. Mill and his school say there is no mental recognition of these facts; Hamilton and his school say there is such a recognition, but only as an inference from nomology. Here, then, is the point. If Mill is correct this theory is swept away at once, for then there is no "voice" within us which "we must accept." If Hamilton is correct, to be a Christian you must be a philosopher. The first theory sweeps us all into outer darkness; the second, every man who is not a philosopher, which we presume would be about ninety-nine out of every hundred, including the author of "Thoughts on Religion."

Before dismissing the writer, let us give one or two more specimens of his "reasoning," because they afford fair samples of the fallacies written, preached and taught by the Broad Church party.

"On the other hand when we read that nearly two thousand years ago, GOD used to send an angel every year to make waves on a pool in Palestine; that the first man who dipped his foot in the pool after it had been moved was cured of any bodily ailment he might have had; and that a poor man was kept waiting uncured for thirty-eight years because he could not pay a servant to dip him, while his richer fellow-sufferers were cured; we disbelieve it for the following reasons: not having seen it ourselves we must depend on the testimony of others. This testimony would also require to be very irresistible in its nature, both from the number of the witnesses and their character, because the event is a very improbable one."

In the first place, it was not yearly, but periodically, it may have been much oftener than once a year. There are mineral baths at the present day which periodically boil up from some volcanic cause, and are particularly beneficial immediately afterwards. If any one should meet the writer and say, I went to such and such mineral baths, and was cured of a cutaneous disorder, he would say, I cannot believe you, it is contrary to experience. Another

poor man might say, I cannot afford to go to the baths, and this was just the case of the cripple on whom our LORD performed the miracle. The fact is that the sacred writer was writing for all ages ; for ages when geological science was well understood, and for ages when it was unknown. He therefore could only speak of a first cause. The angel troubling the water, is perhaps merely a metaphor for the first cause springing immediately from the act of God. To have spoken of volcanic action as the secondary cause would have been to have rendered the narrative unintelligible for centuries after it was written. And it must also be borne in mind that the description of the pool is merely the received impression of the time. The sacred writer is stating the fact of the miracle as it occurred, and he states the surrounding circumstances as they were accepted and received at the time ; for the truth of those surrounding circumstances he is not responsible, as far as any occult or hidden cause is concerned.

The school to which this writer belongs would seem to impose this condition upon all their adherents—to doubt all the articles of the Christian faith. Even in this short pamphlet of thirty pages, we have doubts as to the inspiration of the Bible, doubts of the miracles, doubts of the infallibility of the Church, doubts of the reality of eternal punishment, doubts of the necessity for a great Sacrifice. But in what has he faith left? This he gives in a quotation from Robertson's Sermons :—

“ In spite of all the seeming cruelties of life ; in spite of the clouded mystery in which God has shrouded Himself, in spite of pain and the stern aspect of human life ; and the gathering of thicker darkness and more solemn silence round the soul as life goes on, simply to believe that God is love, and to hold fast to that as a man holds on to a rock with a desperate grip, when the salt surf and the driving waves sweep over him and take the breath away.”

This, he says, is true religion, grand and simple, truth which God has been for ages revealing unto men in all countries, and in all times. Yes ; but why believe that? Is it not contrary to reason that a God who allows us to suffer from all the “seeming cruelties of life” can be good? But why seeming? Are they not real? Are they not facts? What is there seeming or apparent about pain, disease, ill-health, misfortune, death, separation, ingratitude, and a thousand other woes? A man must have faith to believe this ; and if faith in God, why not in His SON? If faith in that SON, why not in His Apostles? If faith in His Apostles, why not in the Church which He founded in them, and through them continued down to our own time. If a writer takes the law of reason for his guide, let him not be afraid of the path down which it leads. Let him not, like a traveller through a valley, when he has descended so low as to have reached the

dark shade of the overhanging hill, stand and watch with lingering eye the last rays of the sun as their reflection dies away on the opposite mountain crest. Why, against all light and reason, hold fast to the belief that God is love, "as a man holds on to a rock with desperate grip when the salt surf and the driving waves sweep over him and take the breath away?" Holding on to this last waif of the Catholic faith, reminds us of the famous prayer—"Oh God, if there be a God, save my soul, if I have a soul."

The author of "Tekel" belongs to an entirely different school. He is evidently an Evangelical, and admits and deplores the decay of the principles he holds. He reviews the various sections of thought in the Church, and no doubt the writer of "Thoughts on Religion" does not feel flattered by the following:

"Then we have the Broad Church party questioning the inspiration of a considerable portion of the Scriptures, cavilling about miracles, exalting science above the Word of God; elevating the reasoning powers of man capable of high attainment, it is true, if rightly directed, but otherwise tending to consequences fatal and fraught with ruin."

Of course the Catholic party under the synonym of "ritualists" come in for their share of opprobrium:

"Next let us consider the clergy of the High Church school, the successors of the Apostles as they wish to be considered. Does *their* teaching, as a rule, tend to exalt the SAVIOUR, and to humble the sinner? Alas! no. The sacraments are by some set forth as having in themselves a saving, regenerating, and life-sustaining power. A belief in the Church, a reliance on forms and ceremonies, the mere *externals* of religion, are maintained as essential. Symbolism in the form, structure, and ornamentation of our ecclesiastical edifices, and in the vestments worn by the officiating ministers, is held to have a high significance. The observance of feasts, fasts, and saints' days is insisted on. Ritualism, varying from moderate to extreme, is considered matter of great moment. *Excessive* choral accompaniment in the service of the Church; everything that can appeal to the senses, indulged whilst the heart is left untouched; a ridiculous coquetry with the idolatrous Church of Rome, and a feeble attempt to imitate its gorgeous and sensuous display, without the courage to identify themselves with the members of that corrupt body;—these, and other remnants of a by-gone age, are set forth by the clergy of this school, instead of that precious SAVIOUR, through Whom alone we can have entrance into the true spiritual Church, and be made members of the Body of CHRIST. Listen to the sermons of these men, abounding in puerilities, dry moral dissertations, lifeless compounds, exhibiting priestly pride, with a small mixture of human infirmity. Blind guides, miserable comforters are all! might be terms fitly applied to the majority of the High Church clergy."

Ritual can never be understood by any but a thoroughly Catholic mind. No Protestant or Anglican reaches up to it. Any fair-

which falls short of Catholicism can never comprehend the objective teaching of elaborate functions. The ritual of the service "commonly called the Mass," as King Edward the Sixth's Prayer Book has it, teaches the reality with which our faith holds CHRIST's presence in the Blessed Sacrament. Ritual is in fact a protestation against any doctrine short of reality or of any scholastic refinement which would philosophise away the reality until for all ordinary minds it has ceased to exist. Now reverence and devotion are the result everywhere of high Catholic ritual and teaching. Wherever you find the latter in the clergy you find the former among the laity and congregation, and in proportion as the Catholic ritual and teaching is intense so are its results. Even our language has altered so as to express our altered meaning. We used to speak of propriety and prayer, now we speak of reverence and devotion. Propriety is a word dealing more with what is due to the respect of our neighbours than to what regards God: and yet how many of us have been taught to behave properly in Church, i.e. so as not to offend the notions of propriety of the rest of the congregation. Again, what a distinction there is between the words prayer and devotion. Prayer is a selfish subjective feeling; devotion is an unselfish objective feeling. Who ever heard the word devotion used by a Protestant? It is part of the Catholic vocabulary and expresses an idea or rather shade of meaning to which Protestants are strangers. It is in the consideration of the differences between such phrases that we learn to grasp fully the distinction between Catholic and Protestant teaching. The Catholic faith is objective; the Protestant subjective. The Catholic Church gives a man objects of contemplation outside himself; she holds up to his view the various truths of her faith, and seeks to work a subjective change in his character by objective teaching. She holds up to his contemplation God in all His majesty; our LORD; the HOLY SPIRIT; she also speaks of CHRIST's Mother the Blessed Virgin, and the Saints: she tells him their lives, and dwells fondly on their faith, their patience, their chastity, and seeks to arouse in him a kindred feeling by the contemplation of their virtues. And then she has a *regimen* for his daily life: she insists on frequent communion; she insists that he should come prepared, and in order that he may come prepared, she preaches the duty of confession and the power of absolution.

The only great engine for "saving souls," is according to the writer of Tekel a stirring and awakening style of sermons. What these sermons should contain is set out as follows:

"1st. The sinfulness of man by nature, and his inability to do anything of himself, that is good in God's sight.

"2ndly. That when we were sinners CHRIST died for us; by His precious blood-shedding made atonement for our sins; and that He ever liveth at the right hand of God to make intercession for us. And

"3rdly. That it is by the HOLY SPIRIT alone that these truths can be savingly applied to our hearts and consciences."

Why is it that English Protestantism grasps this one article of our faith, "the Atonement," in exclusion of all the rest? no doubt it is one of the highest, but as the keystone of a bridge cannot be maintained in its place except by the support of all the other stones in their respective positions, so this one article of faith and its consequents can never hold its proper place in the minds of those who disregard and ignore every other element of Catholic teaching.

As regards the article in the Athanasian Creed which teaches the divine and human nature of our LORD, Protestants have as a rule the faintest idea of its whole meaning; indeed those who would be Catholics in understanding as well as in name must commence with a thorough realisation of this doctrine.

The remedy for the formalism of the High Church party, the rationalism of the Broad, the pride and conceit of the Evangelicals is, according to our author, "lay agency."

"Lay agency, it is believed, is the plan best calculated to meet the exigencies of the Church of England at this time. The question arises, how can it be best applied? the reply is, *only* by allowing *independent* freedom to teach and preach, but without fee or reward, save that of an approving conscience."

Of course, lay agency without discipline, lay agency without obedience, liberty to use the services of the Prayer Book. We presume this includes them all, even the administration of Baptism and the Holy Sacrament, as well as the lesser sacraments of matrimony, orders, &c. The writer is candid; for he continues—

"This proposition may appear startling at the first glance, but let it be calmly considered. What is occurring every day throughout the land, in places where the preaching of the Gospel is ignored and a cold lifeless formalism, a dry system of morality and scepticism, if not downright infidelity substituted instead thereof? An increase of dissent so extensive that it will ere long, if not checked, prove overwhelming."

In the first place, why not? If the Church is only a "congregation of believers," what does it signify if many people are dissenters? If religion is only a faith, every one who holds its leading truths is a Christian, and it cannot matter whether he be a member of the Church of England or of the baptists, methodists, or any other sect. But if the Church of England is a branch of the Catholic faith, if her orders and her sacraments are valid, then it is a question of vital importance whether a man is in communion with her or not; but this writer denies altogether the validity of sacraments except as forms. If then he is correct his

pamphlet is useless, because it cannot matter to what sect a man belongs, so long as that sect hold all the cardinal doctrines of Christianity. But putting aside this question, we are by no means opposed to every scheme which shall enlist the laity as adherents and assistants of the Church. It must be, however, only under discipline. No combined movement can ever succeed, (we might almost say can exist,) without discipline and obedience. Freedom to preach and teach would only produce endless confusion; every man would propound his own theories and enunciate his own views. Even these two pamphlets are specimens: supposing that laymen were allowed to "teach without restriction"—the author of *Thoughts on Religion* would preach against the Inspiration of the Bible or the truth of miracles: the author of *Tekel* against Sacraments and Church government. We should have every man refuting his neighbour: nothing but discord and dispute, and more angry feeling would be aroused by the argument than would be set at rest by the preaching. Every man is not a philosopher. How small a percentage of mankind understand the most ordinary rules of logic and are qualified to lead either themselves or others. In point of fact, the examination of these pamphlets shows us that those who would sail on the current of private judgment, if they avoid Scylla, are pretty sure to be wrecked on Charybdis.

NEALE'S POSTHUMOUS POEMS.

1. *Sequences, Hymns, and other Ecclesiastical Verses.* By the Rev. J. M. NEALE, D.D. London: Hayes.
2. *Stabat Mater Speciosa.* London: Hayes.

No doubt the posthumous works of the great scholar and elegant poet, and devout hymnologist,—one of the earliest contributors to the *Ecclesiastic*,—whom so lately we have seen laid down to sleep, will be numerous and valuable; but an especial tenderness must always attach to the little volume which reached us almost as soon as the hand that wrote it had become cold, and which shows (if indeed we could doubt it) that he who loved chiefly to sing of the "celestial Country," had his thoughts and affections drawn the more closely towards it as he neared that haven. Amid all his deeper works, his translations, his liturgiology, his histories, he is yet chiefly known and chiefly loved, by scholar as by peasant, for his "*Hymns of Home Sickness*," (as the mediævalists quaintly called the longings after the heavenly country;) and this, his latest work, shows us that to the end he was full himself of the thoughts wherewith he has comforted so many weary souls, and whereby he

has given shape and distinctiveness to dim, undefined images of the things which shall be hereafter.

This little volume opens with a characteristic Memorial of Keble, and closes with a magnificent poem, in hexameters, of which the subject is the "Seven Sleepers of Ephesus." It is a grand subject and a grand poem, and we cannot resist giving the concluding portion.

"Now had the ninth hour come; when Iamblichus, equal of Angels,
Calling his brethren to prayer, thus afterwards spake and addresse
them:

'Friends, it is all too plain; our brother has certainly fallen
Into the hands of the wicked; a prey at length to their malice.
Long hours since he might have been here, yet ye see he returns not.
God, the God of all strength, succour *him* whatsoever he suffer! —
God, the God of all comfort, support him and cheer him and crow
him!

What say ye now? Should we still remain here, by his couns
abiding?

Leaving him there as he is, or at once return to the City,
Aiding him—if it may be even yet,—by our prayers and our presence
Thus did Iamblichus ask: to whom John answered on this wise;
'Let us obey to the last the advice he holily counselled—
Spending the hours in the prayer in which but now he was joining:
Long, it may be, ere we reach the Arena, his glorified spirit
Shall have its hard won place in the happy palmiferous number.
Tarry ye here, as before; our prayer will aid him as dearly,
Whether as yet he be prisoner on earth, or Victor in Heaven.
I, as I give this rede, will offer myself to the peril;
I will go down to the City, and bring those things we have need of.'

"Scarce had he spoke, when a soft sweet strain, like a Parad
whisper,

Rose from the downward path, now swelling, now intermitting;
Voices of praise, as it seemed, that, in choral harmony joining,
Told of some joy or some triumph. And hark! they can catch it *more*
clearly;

Still is the cadence: 'CHRIST liveth, CHRIST reigneth, CHRIST *con-*
quereth ever.'

'These are the voices of Angels,' Maximian said to his brethren;
'Ministering spirits are singing our brother to Abraham's bosom.'
Whiles he yet spake, the Cross that headed and guided the Column
Topping the little ascent, was halted in front of the Cavern.
Banners came on behind it and Choristers; Banners displaying
Deeds of the Saints of old, or reciting the Scriptures of Mercy:
Choristers, thundering forth the Hymn of ultimate triumph
Won by the Church o'er the foe, when the Living One went to the
battle.

'How art thou fallen from Heaven, O Lucifer, Son of the morning!
How art thou here cast down to the ground which didst weaken the
nations!

thou shalt rise yet again, yet again shalt thou fall and shalt perish ;
 shed like the sherd of a potter, in pieces ; for God is on our side.
 il to the happy ones now, the precursors and guides to the battle !
 il to the sufferers then ! to the people that walked in darkness,
 kness of dungeon, and darkness of sorrow, and darkness of death-
 shade.

✓ shall they need no candle, nor light of the Sun, for the LORD
 God
 eth them light, and they shall reign for ever and ever.'

All the way through in the pause came sweet young voices in
 cadence ;

CHRIST is King ; CHRIST liveth, CHRIST reigneth, CHRIST conquereth
 alway.'

on their faces the six ; not a moment they thought of enchant-
 ment ;

as they but deemed was the foretaste of heaven,—an angel-pro-
 cession.

stily, therefore, stood forth the Exarch of Ephesus, Memnon.

Hail to the Saints of an age that is past ! rise, brethren, and hear
 me !

tle ye think how God hath laid bare the Arm of His glory.

re, as ye deem, when ye entered, the yesterday's sun set beyond
 you ;

ousands of yesterdays since have rolled on in the story of this
 world.

whose passion ye saw, hath now for two centuries rested,
 hile through the earth hath the Cross marched on from conquest to
 conquest.

me hath bowed down her neck to the Faith : the Cæsar is Christian.

orning by morning the Great Oblation is made in our temple ;

evening by evening doth incense arise midst Chorus and Anthem.

these whom ye see are here to behold the friends of the Martyrs ;

ere to take heart from the men that themselves dared face the Arena.

ome ye, then, brethren, with us : for Constantine waiteth your
 coming ;

ome ye, and see the good things which the LORD hath done for His
 people.

rst, ere we go, receive the kiss of peace from your Bishop.'

us they set forth to return ; with gladness subdued, in procession,

that already they saw that wonderful change passing o'er them ;

change they before had marked when Constantine sat in the Bema.

lent the prayers that arose ; and the six followed also in silence,

ave for one cry of surprise as they entered the gate of Cayster.

indows and house-tops were crammed ; the streets overflowed with
 the faithful ;

ill but one cry of prayer, that ascended like incense to heaven,

lemn and low ; Holy God ! Holy Mighty ! Have mercy upon us !

ow they draw near to the end of their course, to the Church of
 S. Clement ;

There, for the last time on earth, the Seven were gathered together -
 Then did they lead them from Altar to Altar, from Temple to Temple;
 Shrines, that were dear for the blood themselves had seen poured as an
 offering;

Temples enriched with the bodies that they had known cast to the
 vultures.

But when they came in due course to the Church of S. Babylas, for the
 with

Thus for the last time spake Iamblichus, equal of Angels:

'This is our rest for ever; the place we have found to delight in.

Kneel, O brethren; to GOD—GOD of wonders—commending your
 spirits.'

Forthwith the brethren knelt in front of the gate of the Bema;

Fear and astonishment fell on the crowd, and a hush as of midnight.

Silently prayed they awhile: then they sang their '*Nun apolueis*;

Clear and unbroken each voice, as the swan's song ere her departure -

Hushed was the strain at last, but still as in orison knelt they;

Memnon alone drew near, and gently regarding the kneelers,

'Render to God all thanks: the Confessors,' he cried, 'have been
 guerdoned.'

"Ye who are fighting the battle for England's Church and her
 glory,

Whenso that battle seems going against us, remember the legend.

Time there will be, there *will* be, though we never shall see it in this
 world,

When by the hands of the men that come after us God shall upraise
 her;

She whom we fight for now be no more despised and rejected,

But an eternal praise, and a joy of all generations!"—Pp. 207—216.

We have been much struck by a sequence for All Souls, in which
 the mystical meaning of S. Paul's shipwreck is well brought out,
 and which is especially telling from its close adherence, in many
 parts, to the very words of Scripture. From this we are tempted
 to make an extract also.

"As the lingering day was breaking,
 Stood our Captain forth and said,
 (All eternity before us,)
 'I beseech you take some Bread.'

"O that Bread! that Bread of Angels!
 O that Corn of mighty men!
 Never, never had we tasted
 Of its mightiness as then!

"And at length the Master called us;
 (For the time was come at last,
 When the perils of the voyage
 Should for evermore be past;)

" Called us to the latest effort ;
 Bade us all without delay
 Plunge into that self-same sea-surge
 Where our Admiral led the way.

" Planks or spars, or boards or splinters,
 Each and all shall save from loss ;
 Anything Life's Tree hath hallowed ;
 Any fragment of the Cross.

" Blest the wood, whereby salvation
 Cometh to the shipwrecked race !
 Paradise, made sure by Angels,
 Be henceforth our resting-place."—Pp. 40, 41.

We may particularise a " Children's Sequence for All Saints " as being very good. In spite of all the hymns for children that we possess, which are many of them excellent in a devotional point of view, we yet desiderate some hymns more distinctively of praise for children and schools, and if such a collection were made by some one equal to what would be a difficult task, it would be a great gain: in such collection this sequence and some others of Dr. Neale's would find a place. We must not omit to notice the beauty of a sequence for Low Sunday, of which the poetry is exquisite, and which we would transfer to our pages were we not sure that all our readers will possess themselves of this last offering of Dr. Neale to the Church he loved so well.

" Stabat Mater Speciosa " is a companion poem by Jacopone, to his more celebrated " Stabat Mater Dolorosa," and is a devotional and graceful composition. Of the translation we need not speak, it is as perfect as Dr. Neale's works of the kind always are.

DEWES ON THE AUTHORISED VERSION.

A Plea for a New Translation of the Scriptures, with a Translation of S. Paul's Epistle to the Romans. By the Rev. ALFRED DEWES, M.A. London: Longman and Co.

WE consider this a valuable, and upon the whole an impartial contribution towards a right understanding of the New Testament: we say " upon the whole " advisedly; for we seem to detect in it a mind not quite in harmony with the Catholic traditions of the Church. We note this tendency chiefly in two respects; first, in a desire to get rid of dogmatic terms, such as justification; and secondly, in an unmistakeable sympathy with those who deny the eternity of punishment. At the same time the tone of the author's

remarks is modest, while it betokens, as one would expect, a strong amount of personal conviction.

Having made, *in limine*, these necessary qualifications of the entire approval which in many ways we should be glad to accord to this writer, we may now proceed to introduce his work to our readers.

Mr. Dewes begins with some not undeserved strictures on the habit so common among English Churchmen of lavishing unbounded commendations on our Authorised Version,—and, he might have added, “our excellent Liturgy.”

“Perhaps of all living scholars the one who has spoken of it in most enthusiastic terms is Bishop Ellicott. He not only calls it ‘our own noble version,’ but ‘thankfully acknowledges it to be the best translation in the world.’ He is fortunate indeed in being able to form such an opinion; the translations of Scripture are now so numerous, and so limited is the number of them with which any man, who has not devoted his life to the study of languages, can have more than a very superficial acquaintance, that but very few men could venture to select the best. A very ordinary person, however, may be bold enough to remark, that if the Authorised Version be the best of all versions, some of them must be very poor specimens indeed. Nay! let us see what the Bishop himself really thinks of this best of all translations. A noble one it may be; but at the same time it is also ‘incorrect, inexact, insufficient, and obscure.’ Rather serious drawbacks these. And let not any one suppose that such drawbacks are to be found only here and there. The Epistle to the Galatians was the first upon which the Bishop commented; to the commentary he added a revised translation. He tells us that in his translation he has only permitted himself to depart from the Authorised Version where it appeared to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure. Now, the Epistle to the Galatians is by no means the most difficult of S. Paul’s Epistles: moreover, it is but a short one, consisting of six chapters and 149 verses. How many times in those 149 verses does the reader suppose that the Bishop finds the Authorised Version to need correction? No less than 252; in other words, Dr. Ellicott himself considers that version, though it be the best of all, to be incorrect, inexact, insufficient, or obscure, 252 times in 149 verses. That fact alone is startling. Still more startling is it to read that ‘the profound respect he entertains for the Authorised Version would have prevented him from attempting to revise it, if he had not seen that a few corrections, made on a fixed principle, would enable it adequately to reflect the most advanced state of modern scholarship.’ If 252 corrections are needed in 149 verses, the number needed in the whole of the Epistles, not to speak of the other portions of Scripture, must be great indeed. When we find, then, a writer calling them ‘a few corrections made on a fixed principle,’ we are forced to question whether he can ever ask himself the meaning of the words he writes.”—Pp. 1, 2.

But if Mr. Dewes freely criticises the Authorised Version he does not the less spare Drs. Alford and Vaughan, the Five Clergy-

men who gave some years since a specimen revised translation, Professor Jowett, and others. Thus of Dr. Vaughan's translation of the Epistle to the Romans, he says :

"It may be of great use to those who have only a smattering of Greek, and consequently need what schoolboys call a crib ; or even to such of the clergy as either have not had, or have not availed themselves of, the advantages which a public school and university afford. It is not easy to see of what use it can be to any others. Below the translations he gives us 'a free paraphrase'—that most unscholarlike of all things, of which almost the only good that can be said is, that it may save much labour in writing notes. Below that again we have copious notes, which constitute far more than half of what he gives us altogether. The unhappy English reader, who wishes to understand S. Paul, must first of all read an inaccurate and unsatisfactory translation ; he must next compare it with one, which is confessedly not English at all ; he may then get some notion of the meaning by comparing it with a rude paraphrase ; and finally is required to wade through copious notes, before he can hope that the meaning will be clear to him. Is it too late to ask Dr. Vaughan to reconsider his plan ; to save himself and his readers much trouble by giving them such a translation of S. Paul, as he would have required from a boy in the sixth form at Harrow of Plato or Demosthenes ? A well-taught school-boy could translate literally, and give us about as good a literal English version as it is possible to have ; but surely the world is justified in asking far more than that from Dr. Vaughan."—Pp. 34, 35.

Of Dr. Alford he writes :

"He takes great licence in translating the Article, especially when it is in connection with νόμος ; he has a theory that νόμος always means the Jewish law, and to that theory he continually makes the Greek bend : as if we could be more sure about S. Paul's meaning than about the laws of the Greek language. He continually mistranslates tenses, past for present, perfect for aorist, and *vice versâ*. It may be questioned, for instance, whether 'being justified' is the best possible translation of either δικαιούμενοι or δικαιωθέντες ;¹ it certainly cannot correctly translate them both ; yet so he translates them, as indeed do all the others. The distinctions between ὅς, ὅστις, ὃς γε are well known and universally recognised ; yet he never recognises any distinction ; even when they are used in the same sentence in a palpably different meaning."—P. 36.

The "Five Clergymen" receive no higher commendation.

It seems that Mr. Dewes is altogether unacquainted with the new translation of the Bible by Mr. Samuel Sharpe. Regarded as a mere literal rendering of the Greek, we consider it decidedly superior to any of those which are reviewed in this work, although

¹ We are glad to learn in the Correspondence of the *Churchman's Companion* that the wrong translation of Greek tenses and participles in the Authorised Version was commented on at considerable length in the recent Oxford Diocesan Conference.

it is very inelegant and also inconsistent with itself. We should like to have heard Mr. Dewes' estimate of it.

A few words must now be given to Mr. Dewes' specimen-translation. No Epistle is certainly more unintelligible to the mere English reader than that to the Romans; and we quite admit that Mr. Dewes has surmounted many of the chief difficulties of translation. His English is in the main idiomatic and perspicuous, and he shows a very laudable regard to the distinction of tenses in verbs and participles. Articles and particles have their due equivalent assigned to them, and such idioms as *οι πολλοι*, &c. are properly rendered. He does not avoid nevertheless many of the faults which he has charged on the Authorised Version,—particularly the translating the same Greek word in a variety of ways; thus while, as we have said, he entirely eschews the word *justify*, which we much regret, for the etymological meaning of that term is a continual protest against the mere forensic use of the word,—he translates *δικαίω* in at least three different ways.

The aorist participle (chap. v. 1) is fairly translated "having been freed from guilt;" but the present participle (chap. iii. 24) which should be translated "are now in process of being justified or made just," he turns into the verb "are accounted righteous." Where the Authorised Version gives the obscure genitive, "the righteousness of God," Mr. Dewes translates "divine righteousness," which is scarcely less obscure. It should be "the righteousness which God requires."

Again, there is an improvement on the Authorised Version in chap. xv. 16, "That I might be a minister of CHRIST JESUS unto the Gentiles, executing my priestly office in spreading God's glad tidings; in order that the Gentiles may prove an acceptable offering, sanctified in the Holy Spirit,"—but of course it is merely his interpretation to say that "the Gentiles may *prove* an acceptable offering:" whereas it is just as likely to mean that "the Eucharists which they offer may be acceptable." And this is in fact one great drawback to the improved Version, that where our translators have left a passage indeterminate in its meaning, lest inadvertently they should give a wrong meaning, Mr. Dewes hesitates not to supply some word or words which give *his* meaning, (if not that of S. Paul,) and in so doing he does not in any way mark what his additions are.

But here we must stop. If any one wishes to prosecute this subject further, we must refer him to Mr. Dewes' "Plea."

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Law of the Rubric; and the Transition Period of the Church of England. By the Rev. W. H. PINNOCK, LL.D., Cantab., Curate of Somersham, &c. Cambridge: J. Hall and Co. London: Whittaker and Co.

I cannot profess at all to be thankful to Dr. Pinnock for this tractate, which nevertheless, contrary to the author's own personal feelings, concludes that "the advanced Ritualism of the present day is legally right." *neo Danaos.*

The two points on which the question turns are (1) what were the ornaments "in use in the second year of Edward VI.;" and (2) what "the parliamentary authority" referred to in the rubric.

The *S. Barnabas* Judgment ruled that the two were really identical: other words that it was Edward's First Book which prescribed the ornaments, and that that Book was in use by the authority of Parliament.

On this principle the Altar and Vestments are certainly safe; Altar-hits have the highest moral probability in their favour; and the Cross has been already legalised.

Some there are who, not content with this safe and moderate ground of defence, claim the right to use all the ornaments, not expressly condemned,—and we doubt if any ornaments were really condemned by time—which were in use in the Mediæval times.

Dr. Pinnock's line is to adopt this latter view,—but then to argue that if the Ritualists use this liberty they are to be restrained by Act of Parliament. Our answer to this most traitorous view is, that if the ritual of the Church of England,—and if the Ritual why not the Doctrine?—is to be dependent on a majority in the House of Commons, it is useless to appeal to historical and documentary evidence of any kind. The doom of the Church of England would be come.

Dr. Pinnock, we doubt not, can write useful "Catechisms" and "Analyses," but he is quite out of his element in attempting to treat matters involving Principles.

The Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms: their Divine Inspiration, &c. By JOHN COLLYER KNIGHT, of the British Museum. London: Longman and Co.

WE cannot but maintain, as we have done before, that books such as this before us are more injurious even than those which are directly hostile. Mr. Knight does not deny inspiration, but presumes in the most arbitrary manner to discriminate between what he calls the religious and the human element in Scripture. Of such a system the result must necessarily be, that on the one hand all reverent minds, who desire to see the Divine Author in "all Scripture," literally in every word, would be shocked to find those portions of Holy Scripture which

they had treasured up, and which have spoken to them of the God-Man, of Sacraments, and of the Eternal Priesthood, swept away, as unimportant details and useless narratives! On the other hand, such as despise authority, and desire to be ruled only by their own judgment, would get their self-dependence strengthened. The Bible, which came from the Mind of the Infinite, is subjected to the private scrutiny of finite individuals, each one feeling himself a competent critic, empowered to pronounce upon supposed corruptions in the Infallible Scriptures, and justified in his individual conclusions, however they may be opposed to those of others, or to the Church of CHRIST, as the only legitimate interpreter of Holy Writ. Upon this principle every man is his own Priest, and every man too is his own Bible. What he wills to be the religious element, he decides to be inspired; and what he considers unimportant is condemned as uninspired. Where, then, is our perfect Bible? Gone; and with it all that we hold precious. For, in truth, the Church and the entire Bible must stand or fall together.

Our author has no appreciation, we feel, of the entirety of the Sacramental system set forth in God's dealings with man, throughout all time. The oneness of the types of the Old Testament and the antitypes in the New, of the old and the new dispensation, of the human and Divine elements in Holy Scripture, of the two natures in CHRIST, and of the outward and inward parts in the Sacraments, is not acceptable to his mind, or he would see that, in the very apparent weakness of the human element, lies hidden the perfection of Almighty Wisdom and Truth.

With regard to the Book of Proverbs, Mr. Knight argues that the mere fact of its being quoted in the New Testament does not establish its divine origin, and that some persons contend that the maxims in this Book are rather prudential than religious; and he adds, "Perhaps they are; perhaps they are not; let each man judge for himself. No authorised canon, no divinely-inspired council, has any authority over our faith in this matter"! Upon his own principle, therefore, the whole of Mr. Knight's attempts to reconcile Scripture with Scripture, (in which, so far as they go, he has succeeded,) are thrown away; for some one else is perfectly at liberty to decide, according to the individual character of his own mind, and the line of division between the religious and human element may be drawn in quite an opposite direction. Thus, if the "seamless garment" of Holy Scripture be rent, where shall we stop? Not until CHRIST Himself is stripped of His Divinity, and the Unity of the Triune Godhead Itself be questioned. If, therefore, the Creator be the Author of Holy Scripture at all, it must be lifted far above the range of the aggregate intellect of the creature. It is impossible that He can have so blended His own Divine Spirit with the imperfections of mere human compositions and stories; for the very union with Himself implies sanctification. As the WORD by taking flesh made it holy, so when the HOLY GHOST thought fit to express His Mind in human language, He thereby sanctified it wholly; and as CHRIST's Humanity shone more brightly by His Death, so also we believe that, out of the ignominy to which these critics expose the Holy Bible shall it rise to a new and more glorious life in the Church. But as we dare not attempt to make any division between God and Man in CHRIST, neither

in we attempt to say of the Scriptures that some portions are of God and others of man. What God hath thus joined together we cannot put asunder, without incurring the risk of eternal separation from him.

Five plain Sermons on the Sacrament of the Altar. (Masters.) These Sermons are among the best and most perfect we have ever seen. In their distribution they would, we consider, be invaluable; for they are written in such simple and well-chosen language, that it would be impossible for any one to read them and not be deeply edified. They are evidently the production of a high and spiritual mind, of one who appreciates, to the full, the vastness of the Sacramental system, resulting from and culminating in, the Incarnation, as the centre and source of all grace to the soul. They convey a complete idea of the Sacrament as a means of grace—of union with CHRIST—of propitiation; and further (Sermon v.) of the nature of the preparation required of communicants. The latter subject has the additional merit of treating the doctrine of Absolution in such a winning and persuasive manner as to commend it even to the most prejudiced reader.

But few words are needed to express our disapproval of Mr. STEVENS' pamphlet on *Infant and Adult Baptism* (Macintosh.) It is written with the view of convincing the Baptist of the efficacy of Infant Baptism, but it does not contain anything new. It is a pity that so soon as men get hold of a theological idea they at once think they are competent to write upon it. We have gone over this ground so often that we shall simply say that Mr. Stevens knows nothing of Baptism as a sacrament. He makes regeneration to depend on the Faith of the congregation; and states that *all* infants are not thus necessarily spiritually born again. In fact he represents the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration as a "pernicious and dangerous doctrine."

Mr. RIDLEY has published the second and concluding part of his *Every-day Companion* (Mozleys,) which supplies a good model of quiet meditative devotion.

A work, entitled *Reflections concerning the Expediency of a Council of the Church of England and the Church of Rome being holden, with a view to accommodate Religious Differences*, by SAMUEL WIX, has just been reprinted by the Church Press Company. It was originally published in 1818, and we think they have judged wisely in bringing it out, although the speed at which the literary world has moved since its first appearance, makes its old-fashioned style of thought and language seem like the product of a past age. The book passed through two editions, but does not appear to have attracted much notice, excepting from the Bishop of S. David's of that period, whom it roused to an unmeasured and unreasoning animosity, which relieved itself by the wholesale employment of such epithets as "antichristian," "idolatrous," "heretical;" and the latter part of Mr. Wix's volume is devoted to answering the furious onslaught of this dignitary, in a temperate but withal very masterly manner. That, however, which will

most strike the reader of the present day is the fact, that a Clergyman of the Church of England, writing before the first dawn of the Church's great revival, possessed views as catholic and sound on all controverted points as the most advanced Churchman of our own day, while he shared to the full in those yearnings for unity which are amongst the most characteristic of the present "signs of the times." The manner in which he deals with the vexed questions which lie between the Churches of Rome and England is well worthy of study, and the large concessions which he is disposed to make as an honest and peace-loving man, sufficiently disprove the common accusation, that similar proposals made at the present time by those who would promote the unity of Christendom are merely the fruit of modern extravagance of ideas. This work is enriched with a large number of striking extracts from older authors, and we should be glad to think it would be read more than we fear it is likely to be.

The history of a sojourn in the Holy Land, detailed for the amusement of children, cannot of course be expected to contain anything new, either as to the well-known localities of which it speaks, or the thoughts suggested by them; but the little book, entitled *A Winter in the East, in Letters to the Children at Home*, just published by Mr. Masters, will at least well answer the purpose for which it is intended. Its very simple language and clear descriptions will be thoroughly appreciated by the young people, who might find more learned books of travel beyond their comprehension; and the religious tone of the little work, though very moderate and unenthusiastic, will still tend to produce a more reverent dealing with the associations of those holy places, than many books of far greater pretensions.

Trust, (Masters,) in addition to good practical teaching and interest of narrative, contains also some really good descriptions of scenery both in France and at Rome.

Any one taking up a goodly volume, in mauve-coloured binding, lettered *The Churches of Asia*, (Parker,) would be surprised to find that it was simply a volume of sermons, by the Rev. W. MITCHELL. The sermons in themselves are neither very good nor bad; but we must protest against S. John's Epistles to the Seven Churches being treated simply as so many counsels against "lukewarmness" and "inconsistency," and the like.

We are glad to find that the Author of certain uncatholic Letters against the use of the Eucharistic Vestments, reprinted from "The Churchman," admits, that in dedicating them to the Bishop of Oxford he has no authority to commit his Lordship to an approval of their contents. Under these circumstances it would* have been a more honourable course, it seems to us, not to have used the Bishop's name at all. The letters are altogether below *par*.

It is a good sign that the demand for Sutton's *Godly Meditations* on the Blessed Sacrament continues so firm, as to warrant the publication of a new edition. This was one of Parker's early reprints. The new edition is in larger type and paper.

SIR SAMUEL BAKER ON THE EVANGELIZATION OF AFRICA.

The Albert N'yanza Great Basin of the Nile, and Exploration of the Nile Sources. By SAMUEL WHITE BAKER, M.A., F.R.G.S., &c. &c. Macmillan and Co.

RECENT geographical discoveries have dispelled the mystery which hung over the interior of Africa ; but while all are now agreed that it is not the torrid desert which we once thought it, the reports which we receive of the character and capacity of the Africans are of the most contradictory nature. By some they are described as brutal in instincts, bestial in capacity, mean and ferocious, cruel and treacherous ; creatures grovelling in the lowest pit of moral defilement and intellectual abasement ; wretched materialists, without any idea of a Supreme Being, and so spiritually obtuse as to be incapable of receiving the Christian Religion. By others it is said that the relics of the primitive good are by no means extinct in them ; that though degraded they are not wholly corrupted ; that they still possess many admirable traits of character, can appreciate justice, and are grateful for kindness ; that when their confidence is once gained they are faithful and affectionate ; that they are intellectually capable of a higher elevation than is generally imagined ; that they are susceptible of religious impressions, and in one form or another retain the conviction that beyond the powers of nature there is One Who visits the earth, interposes in the affairs of men, and has in some mysterious way connected guilt and retribution, sin and pain.

There are three reasons, it seems to us, for this diversity of opinion. First, the various African tribes differ in character and capacity almost as widely as the different races in some parts of Asia. All are distinctly African ; but compare the Bushman with the Zulu, or the amiable Mozambique tribes with the people of Dahomey, and in physical attributes and social characteristics no people can be more unlike. Again, there are the Massai, the Matabele, and others—tribes whom you may extirpate but cannot enslave ; who in adversity manifest a heroism which, were they not African, would win for them the admiration of the world ; whom you may torture to death, but cannot subdue ; who rise superior to pain, and die defying their enemies and threatening vengeance. To class such people as these, as is frequently done, with the readily degraded West Coast Negro, and because they are African, to include them in the condemnation which he provokes, is as absurd as it is unjust.

Secondly, External influences have in some places injuriously

affected the Africans. There can be no question as to the truth of this. Wherever the Africans are found removed from the vicious state of things which generally prevails on the coasts—a state of things in many instances brought about by bad Christian men, and from the demoralising influences of the slave trade, there they are invariably discovered to be in a less degraded condition. Men led on by a lust of gain, the desire to make wealth speedily, have gone again and again to Africa; they have acquired power there, and, instead of using that power to God's honour and glory, instead of making the utmost effort and sacrifice to raise the heathen with whom they have been brought in contact from the degradation of heathenism, they have set tribe against tribe in order that they might purchase the captives for slaves; they have added wilful sin to the ignorance wherein the heathen were living; they have introduced among them new forms of wickedness, and a foul train of misery and ever-breeding sin; and they have made the coast tribes, and all others to whom their baneful influence has extended, tenfold more the children of the devil than they would have been had they been left to themselves.

Thirdly, Men regard the Africans from a different point of view, and approach them for different purposes. Take Dr. Livingstone and the author of the book before us as illustrations of this.

For some years Livingstone worked as a missionary among tribes far removed from the boundaries of civilisation. He was, it is true, the exponent of a very imperfect form of Christianity, and the result of his work would, doubtless, have been more satisfactory had he not been a schismatic; but notwithstanding the difficulties under which he consequently laboured, his experience convinced him that the ideas commonly entertained of the mental and spiritual capacity of the Africans were unjust, and circumstances favouring his inclination, he resolved, after having become intimately acquainted with the manners and customs, the language and character of the people with whom he had been living, to devote his life to travel in Africa in order that he might gain additional knowledge of the country and its peoples, open highways into the interior, and by his discoveries and representations excite his countrymen to extend to the unhappy Africans the blessings of religion and civilization. This, we believe, is a fair statement of Livingstone's first position in Africa, and of the motives which prompted him to undertake those great journeys which have made him famous.

It is evident that a man thus prepared and influenced would look upon the Africans from a very different point of view, and travel among them for a very different purpose to Sir Samuel Baker, who, with no liking for country or people, and with a head full of modern scientific (irreligious) notions about the origin of both, plunges into the interior of Africa in order to accomplish a

geographical feat. In the one case you have a man animated by a grand principle which is the mainspring and motive of his actions, who, after years of experience, regards religion as the great cure of human woe and the truest source of civilization ; in the other, a man ambitious of the celebrity attending heroic achievement, and engaged in a desperate exploration which, if successful, would for ever associate his name with the discovery of the sources of the most renowned river of the world, and who might be a heathen for any appreciation of the power and blessing of Christianity which he manifests.

Now if we accept Dr. Livingstone (as we are fairly entitled to do,) as the representative of those who think favourably of the Africans, who regard them as members of the great human family for which CHRIST died, and capable of receiving the new birth unto righteousness by which men become members of that Mystical Body of which CHRIST is the Head and Centre ; and Sir Samuel Baker, as the representative of those who deny them to be of the same origin as ourselves, hold them incapable of becoming Christians, deem them irreclaimably barbarous and vile (and after a careful perusal of his book we think him entitled to this position,) we see why it is they differ so widely in their conclusions.

These remarks were suggested by and have a direct bearing upon the two goodly looking volumes which contain the record of Sir Samuel Baker's exploration of the sources of the Nile, during which he was accompanied by Lady Baker, whose affection for her husband transformed the gentle lady into a heroine of devotion and strength, and to whose gentleness and womanly tact it seems owing quite as much as to his strong will and powerful muscles that a successful result was ensured.

As a narrative of daring adventure, of much enduring courage, of never flagging resolve, this book must take precedence of most other books of its class. But while giving it all the praise it thus undoubtedly deserves, we cannot say that it greatly increases our knowledge of Africa, save in one particular, or of the Africans. Speke's discovery of the Source of the Nile is confirmed, and another lake which he imagined to exist is made known to us not as an additional, but as a joint Source. It is something to have been partly instrumental in settling a question which has been a mystery exciting and perplexing the imaginations of men for ages, and in the applause of his countrymen, and the honour which has been conferred upon him by his queen, Sir Samuel Baker has a suitable reward, and we are not sorry to find that deeds of peaceful heroism, such as his, have met with royal recognition.

It is not, however, with Sir Samuel's book as a record of exploration and adventure that we as theologians have to deal. We do not underrate the importance of such discoveries as he, Livingstone, Burton, Speke and others have made ; we do not think

lightly of the perils through which they have passed, and the self-devotion which has enabled them to conquer whole provinces of the world for human knowledge, and we trust for religion and civilization also ; but had the book before us been confined to a record of the author's prowess with men and beasts, difficulties met and overcome, &c., it would not, we need scarcely say, have met with special notice in the pages of the *Ecclesiastic*. But Sir Samuel aims at more than this : he gives us his opinions upon the Africans, their capacities and possibilities, morally and spiritually, and he proposes plans for bringing them under the ameliorating influences of civilization, if not of Christianity, and by so doing he has placed himself within our field of observation.

The preparations for his journey were made at Khartoum, a town under Egyptian government, and a den of robbers and murderers. Here congregate Arabs, Turks and others, the worst men of this bad part of the world, and from thence they issue nominally to trade with the tribes of the interior, but in reality to plunder, to kill and enslave them. Sir Samuel gives a minute account of their method of proceeding, than which nothing can be more horrible ; the cruelty of which these men are said to be guilty is past description shocking.

Acting, however, we presume, upon the principle which he himself enunciates, "The success of an expedition depends upon the perfection of details," and also upon the agents employed to carry it out, he engages a number of these desperados to accompany him ; and, as we might expect, the first volume of his narrative is principally occupied with descriptions of his disputes with these fellows, who plunder him, plot against him, and at last abandon him at Gondokoro.

The condition of the people between Khartoum and Gondokoro seems wretched in the extreme. For generations they have been forced to submit to the tyranny and exactions of the Turks ; they are all but brutalised, and, though living in the fertile valley of the Nile, are in a state of chronic starvation. Sir Samuel had a dreary passage through this land, and seems to visit the disgust produced upon his mind by what he saw, and by the ill conduct of his band of ruffians, upon the unfortunate natives. He sees their degradation, and he denounces not the men who have brought it to pass, but their poor victims. He visits a chief named Nuêhr, and, says he, this man "exhibited his wife's arms and back covered with jagged scars, in reply to my question as to the use of the spiked iron bracelet. Charming people are these blacks ! as they are termed by English sympathisers ; he was quite proud of having clawed his wife like a wild beast." (Vol. i. p. 63.)

Considering the example which the Turks and Arabs had set this man, it ought not to be surprising that he, a poor heathen, should follow it, but we will venture to say that among the natives who

had not been brought under the demoralising influences to which this man had been exposed, Sir Samuel met with no other instance of similar brutality. But supposing he had, such men as Nuêhr are to be met with in other countries than Africa. Here, in Christian England, we count our women-beaters by the thousand. We saw a woman the other day (a good Christian woman she was, too,) whose husband gloried in his ill-usage of her: he had knocked out her teeth, jumped upon her, broken her ribs, and crippled her for life; but it would be as unjust to describe the whole race of Englishmen as unmanly brutes because of this individual's cruelty, as it is to infer that the Africans are wild beasts because Nuêhr "clawed his wife." With the conduct of Katchibi, the chief of Obbo, fresh in his memory, Sir Samuel might have spared us this sneer against the whole race of Africans. Benighted, degraded heathen that he was, Katchibi, according to the account given of him, acted like a man of honour and a gentleman. While Sir Samuel was away, he protected Lady Baker from insult, and shielded her from the possibility of annoyance as carefully as a Christian gentleman would protect his wife or his mother, and he supplied her wants with a generosity which should have won from Sir Samuel a more generous appreciation of the race to which he belonged. At Khartoum, and between that place and Gondokoro, some attempt to Christianise the natives appears to have been made by Hanoverian and Austrian missionaries. The attempt seems to have failed, and Sir Samuel Baker at once proclaims the natives incapable of receiving the Christian religion. Considering the infamous usage which the natives have for so long a time received at the hands of the Turks and Arabs, whom they regard equally with Europeans as "white men," it does not appear to us at all surprising that they should refuse to accept the white man's religion. Speaking of the Bari tribe, a people living about Gondokoro, Sir Samuel says—"The people of the country were formerly friendly, but the Khartoumers pillage and murder them at discretion in all directions; they in revenge will shoot a poisoned arrow at a stranger unless he is powerfully protected." (Vol. i. p. 91.)

And again—

"The traders' people, in order to terrify them into submission, were in the habit of binding them, hands and feet, and carrying them to the edge of a cliff about thirty feet high, a little beyond the ruins of the old Mission House; beneath this cliff the river boils in a deep eddy; into this watery grave the victims were remorselessly hurled as food for crocodiles. It appeared that this punishment was dreaded by the natives more than the bullet or rope, and it was accordingly adopted by the *trading parties*."—Vol. i. p. 93.

Surely it is not to be wondered at if the natives set their hearts against the religion of men whom they identified with the fiends in human shape who treated them with this horrible cruelty, or carried

them away into abject slavery. The feeling with which the Spanish conquerors of America inspired the Indians, and which was terribly illustrated by the reply of a chief when urged by Velasquez to embrace Christianity, in order that he might be admitted into heaven, is doubtless the feeling of these wretched Africans. "Shall I meet the white men in heaven?" asked the Indian; and when he was answered in the affirmative, "Then," said he, "I will not be a Christian; for I would not go again to a place where I must find men so cruel."

In America, the terrible system of the conquerors marred all their proselytizing efforts, and the Indians allowed themselves to be extirpated rather than converted. So, too, in Africa, the indiscriminate massacres perpetrated by the slavers, the revolting iniquities of which they are guilty, make the conversion of the natives, with whom they come in contact, to Christianity almost an impossibility. And we are not surprised, therefore, to hear that the mission near Gondokoro, where these bad men pursued their wicked career unchecked, was given up; but we regret to hear that the head of the mission—

"Herr Morlang acknowledged with great feeling that the mission was useless among such savages; that he had worked with much zeal for many years, but that the natives were utterly impracticable. They were far below the brutes, as the latter show signs of affection to those who are kind to them; while the natives, on the contrary, are utterly obtuse to all feelings of gratitude." "He described the people as lying and deceitful to a superlative degree; the more they receive the more they desire, but in return they will do nothing."—Vol. i. p. 78.

We regret, we repeat, to hear this unqualified complaint and condemnation of the natives; for considering the horrible state of things to which they have had to submit, for centuries probably, it would have been a marvel had they been better disposed than they were. Nothing, probably, can be more hopeless than the attempts to carry on mission work among the Africans who are slaves, or who have been demoralized by the operations of the slave trader, and Herr Morlang, while acknowledging his failure, should have assigned it to its true cause. God be thanked, the Church of England can testify to a more satisfactory result of her labours among the savage tribes of Africa. Among the Zulus at Kwamagwaza, at Umlazi, and other places, and among other tribes in the southern extremity and western parts of Africa—wherever, in fact, the Africans are removed from the curse of slavery, and the iniquitous operations of the slave trade, and the Church has faithfully used those mighty powers with which she has been entrusted by her Divine Head, the powers of the world to come,—there converts have been multiplied. There too the converted Africans have manifested the fruits of the Spirit equally with the European, and by making them living branches of the Vine, members of CHRIST,

true descendants, spiritually, of the Second Adam, the quickening Spirit has proved them to be the descendants, naturally, of the first man Adam, the living soul.

But even among the natives with whom Sir Samuel Baker became conversant, Christianity did not utterly fail of producing good effects; for the only faithful members of his expeditionary party were Christians! They were Richarn, a man, and Saal, a boy. The former is thus introduced to us—

"My black fellow, Richarn, whom I had appointed corporal, will soon be reduced to the ranks; the animal is spoiled by sheer drink. Having been drunk every day in Khartoum, and now separated from his liquor, he is plunged into a black melancholy. He sits upon the luggage like a sick rook, doing minstrelsy, playing the rababa (guitar,) and smoking the whole day, unless asleep, which is half that time: he is sighing after the merissa (beer) pots of Egypt. He was brought up from boyhood at the Austrian Mission, and he is a genuine specimen of the average results. He told me a few days ago that 'he is no longer a Christian.'"—Vol. i. p. 51.

And yet away from Khartoum, where many a better nurtured Christian might have fallen from grace, Richarn's conduct compels his master to say, "Richarn had his good points; he was honest, and much attached to his master and mistress;" and this, notwithstanding Herr Morlang, who declared the natives to be without affection for those who are kind to them, utterly obtuse to all feelings of gratitude, and below the brutes. And no one can read this book without seeing—though it is not at all times acknowledged—that throughout Sir Samuel Baker's journey of peril, and especial temptation to such a man as Richarn, this poor half-instructed Christian African was a devoted and a faithful servant, frequently manifesting qualities of which a better informed European Christian might be proud. But what of Saal? He, says his master—

"was a boy that would do no evil; he was honest to a superlative degree, and a great exception to the natives of this wretched country. He was a native of Fertit, and was minding his father's goats, when a child of about six years old, at the time of his capture by the Beggara Arabs. He described vividly how men and camels suddenly appeared while he was in the wilderness with his flock, and how he was forcibly seized and thrust into a large sack, and slung upon the back of a camel, carried hundreds of miles to Dongola on the Nile, at which place he was sold to traders, and then taken to Cairo to be sold for a drummer."

But being too young he was rejected, and hearing from another slave boy of the mission station at Cairo that the missionaries would protect him, he escaped from the traders, and made his way to the station, where he was disciplined and taught as much of the Christian religion as he could understand. In company with a

branch of this mission establishment he went to Khartoum, from thence to the White Nile Mission Station in the Shillock country, where the climate kills thirteen of the missionaries. He then returns to Khartoum, and from the time that Lady Baker extends her protection to this boy to the hour of his death, his good conduct and good feeling seem to have been invariable. Indeed when, after having surmounted the dangers of the perilous journey, and having been to his master and mistress a living witness to the power of Christianity to produce even in the degraded African heathen child all that was "lovely and of good report," he is called to his rest, Sir Samuel testifies that "he had lived and died in our service a good Christian."

After such testimony it does seem to us strange and contradictory to hear Sir Samuel pronouncing the Africans incapable of improvement spiritually, and declaring that it is not only useless to take Christianity to them, but that it is equally useless to take them to Christianity, as they have a nature "which will not alter with a change of locality, but the instincts of the evil race will be developed in any country where they may be located." Surely there must be much spiritual obtuseness in the man who thus fails to appreciate the all-powerful influences of Christianity after he had been a witness of them in the case of the only two faithful and devoted followers he had. But Sir Samuel is not consistent with himself. He evidently went out to Africa filled with certain preconceived ideas respecting the African, and wherever he can he gives expression to these notions. Every now and then however his actual experience compels him to record a fact which shows to every one but himself that these notions are wrong; he does not see this, apparently, and he does not harmonise his ideas with his facts. The result is this: he maintains his own opinions, but his experience convinces his readers that his opinions are wrong.

At Gondokoro Sir Samuel meets with Speke and Grant, who were returning to England after proving that the idea of the former as to the source of the Nile was to all intents and purposes correct. The information they gave, and their experience in the country into which Sir Samuel penetrated, made the journey to, and the exploration of the Albert N'yanza a far easier task than it would otherwise have been.

At Gondokoro also Sir Samuel's Khartoumers, after having vainly compassed his life, forsook him. But he was resolved at all hazards to accomplish the object he had in view, and finding that he could do it in no other way, he did not hesitate to bribe the leader of a band of Arab slavers, robbers and murderers, and went forward as the ally of men who plundered and killed wherever they went, and who were regarded by the natives whom they could not seduce into a traitorous alliance, with fear and abhorrence. This was a price which we are sorry to find that any Christian gentleman

could bring himself to pay in order to gratify his ambition. From this time, therefore, Sir Samuel is in a false position, and like all men who have wilfully chosen such a position, he is exposed to difficulties and misapprehension which vex his soul, but do not open his eyes to his own mistake, to say the least of it.

At Latooka, Adda the chief of the country, seeing him associated with the Arab traders' band of robbers, very naturally concludes him to be one of the same character and profession as they, and having a cause of complaint against a subordinate chief, asks Sir Samuel to join him in an attack upon the offender's village. Upon which we are told, that

"Nothing is more heartbreaking than to be thoroughly misunderstood, and the obtuseness of the savages was such that I never could make them understand the existence of good principle; their one idea was power, force that could obtain all, the strong hand that could wrest from the weak."

And then in disgust at this obtuseness of the savages who could not see that he was the saint among the sinners with whom he companied, he gives the following extract from his journal.

"1863, 10 April, Latooka: I wish the black sympathisers in England could see Africa's inmost heart as I do: much of their sympathy would subside. Human nature viewed in its crude state as pictured amongst African savages is quite on a level with that of the brutes, and not to be compared with the noble character of the dog. There is neither gratitude, pity, love, nor self-denial; no idea of duty; no religion; but covetousness, ingratitude, selfishness and cruelty. All are thieves, idle, envious, and ready to plunder, and enslave their weaker neighbours."—Vol. i. p. 243.

Had Sir Samuel said this of his Arab allies we should have had no difficulty in seeing the truthfulness of the description, but when he says it of the natives, we cannot help seeing that he has laid to their charge things which he does not and cannot prove. But supposing they were as bad as he describes them to be, he is wrong in imagining that the sympathy of Christians would subside; degraded as they are, we have only to read the first chapter of St. Paul's epistle to the Romans and we shall see that they are no worse, probably not so bad, as the heathen of his day. And yet the apostle considered himself their debtor, and was ready in his love for them and in order that his Divine Master might see of the travail of His soul among them, to lay down his life for their good. Sir Samuel does not really seem to understand what Christianity is, or what it has done for the world. Religion and civilization are synonymous terms in his mind, and if we were to ask him, What is a Christian? we should expect an answer not altogether in accordance with the teaching of the Catechism of the Church. No doubt his position at Latooka was a very trying one,

but he brought it upon himself. There was no absolute necessity for him to proceed to the Albert N'yanza. He resolved, however, to do so, and in order that he might carry out his resolution he did not hesitate to become for the time the companion of thieves. It is said that a man is judged of by his companions more than by his words: the natives of Latooka possibly have some such proverb among themselves, and judged of Sir Samuel accordingly. We pity him when he exclaims,

"No one can imagine the hardships and annoyances to which we are subject, with the additional disgust of being somewhat dependent upon the traders' band of robbers."—Vol. i., p. 347.

But we regret that he should in his disgust at his self-chosen position have been unjust to the natives. That he was so we think the following extract, written probably when less under the influence of the bilious remittent fever of the land will suffice to show.

"The black man is a curious anomaly, the good and bad points of human nature bursting forth without any arrangement, like the flowers and thorns of his own wilderness. A creature of impulse, seldom actuated by reflection, the black man astounds by his complete obtuseness, and as suddenly confounds you by an unexpected exhibition of sympathy. From long experience with African savages, I think it is as absurd to condemn the Negro *in toto*, as it is preposterous to compare his intellectual capacity with that of the white man.

"In his savage home what is the African? Certainly bad; but not so bad as white men would (I believe) be under similar circumstances. He is acted upon by the bad passions inherent in human nature, but there is no exaggerated vice, such as is found in civilized countries. The strong takes from the weak; do not perhaps we in Europe? these are the legitimate acts of independent tribes authorised by their chiefs. They mutually enslave each other; how long is it since America and *we ourselves* ceased to be slave-holders? He is callous and ungrateful; in Europe is there no ingratitude? He is cunning and a liar by nature; in Europe is all truth and sincerity? Why should the black man not be equal to the white? He is as powerful in frame, why should he not be as exalted in mind?"—Vol. i., pp. 288, 9.

And so it is throughout his book. You must appeal from Sir Samuel, we will not say, drunk, to Sir Samuel sober, but from Sir Samuel besotted by fever, and under the influence of preconceived and false ideas of the Africans, to Sir Samuel in health and seeing things as others less prejudiced see them, in order to obtain anything like a fair estimate of the people he visited. It is a pity however, some one did not take his book in hand and at least make it consistent with itself.

At Latooka, however, he had a proof that the Africans are not destitute of patriotism and heroism. Another daring party composed mainly of the men who deserted him at Gondokoro, and

headed by a man named Ibrahim, attacked some native villages. The people of Latooka, though armed only with spears, while the slavers had guns, united and repelled those bad men: they compelled them to retreat, drove them into a mountain pass, and at length forced them over a precipice; Ibrahim and the whole of his party perished. But we find no tribute of admiration of this deed, worthy to be placed side by side with some of the heroic achievements of the heathen of antiquity, and for the sake of Sir Samuel we are sorry for it.

We have not space to go into further detail. We think, however, that we have shown, even upon Sir Samuel's own testimony, that the Africans are not hopelessly corrupted, and do not lie beyond the possibility of recovery. However much they may differ from us by outward circumstances and acquired habit, we find that they have the same instincts and same natural feelings, and that there are among them the same indications of human nature as we ourselves possess. The great difference between them and us is this—they are heathen, beset by all the sins and ignorances of long ages of heathenism; and we are Christians, enjoying all the benefits and blessings accruing to us from long ages of Christianity. The question is, Can they be made to participate in the blessings we enjoy? What course should we pursue in order to bring them within the fold of CHRIST's flock?

Of course Sir Samuel supplies us with an answer. He insists that civilization must precede Christianity. "True Christianity," says he in his Introduction, "cannot exist apart from civilization; thus, the spread of Christianity must depend upon the extension of civilization, and that extension depends upon commerce."

"The philanthropist and the missionary will expend their noble energies in vain in struggling against the obtuseness of savage hordes, until that first step towards their gradual enlightenment shall have been commenced. The savage must learn to want, he must learn to be ambitious, and to covet more than the mere animal necessities of food and drink. This can alone be taught by communion with civilized beings; the sight of men clothed will induce the naked savage to covet clothing, and will create a want; the supply of this demand will be the first step towards commerce. To obtain the supply the savage must produce some article in return as a medium of barter, some natural production of his country adapted to the trader's wants. His wants will increase as his ideas expand by communication with Europeans. His productions must increase in due proportion, and he must become industrious, industry being the first grand stride towards civilization."

And this is Sir Samuel's plan, and the plan we doubt not of numberless others who think themselves very good Christians; for the temptation to Christianity now-a-days is to take the world on the devil's terms and not on God's—to hold for commerce and

not for CHRIST—to seek the welfare of the world by the indirect agencies of commerce and civilization, instead of by the direct agency of the Church. Wait, says the politician; wait, say the princes of commerce; wait, now say the men of science; wait for a time, the Church can come in by-and-by, it has not the power to convert until we have prepared the way. And so the Evil One is still at hand, still tempting CHRIST in His members, to take the world on his terms—"All these will I give Thee," said he to our Divine Head; "All these will I give thee," is he now crying to Christendom, if you will but listen to my suggestions, if you will but adopt my plans. That the Christian now-a-days possesses, in superior knowledge and skill, in the gifts and refinements of civilization much that may win the attention of the heathen to the higher gift of eternal life, we do not deny; but these are but secondary aids, and must accompany, not precede Christianity. It is quite certain that "true Christianity cannot exist apart from civilization;" but it is equally certain that true civilization cannot exist apart from Christianity. Attempt to civilize and not Christianise, and in most cases you will make Christianity impossible. Make commerce your pioneer, let commerce and commerce only have sway before you set the Church to work, and there will indeed spring up obstacles to our holy religion, such as prevail in some parts of Africa, where for ages commerce alone has had the field, and as exists in China, India, and elsewhere, which may seem to some almost beyond the power of the Church to remove.

The Church, however, is the channel of all grace. It is indwelt by the HOLY SPIRIT, Who sanctifies and gives life to all her acts, and Who by CHRIST's duly authorised ministers acts upon the souls and spirits of men, as He acts by none other; but it is only by planting the Church in all lands upon that model which the HOLY GHOST inspired His own first missionaries to set forth, that we have any right to expect success. It is because we have not sufficiently realised this, because we have been content to send among the heathen in Africa and elsewhere a solitary priest here, an unordained catechist there, that we have so often failed of success, and that the heathen are still rooted in their heathenism. The spirit of the Church was for years paralysed by the spirit of the world. She had not lost the power, but she did for a time lose the will to convert the heathen. Human nature has, in all essential features, been one and the same in all ages of the world, and is one and the same in all parts of the world. Human error also has ever been essentially the same, however varied its manifestation in different ages and localities. The Church now possesses the same spiritual powers which it possessed in the days of the Apostles and their successors, which it possessed in the days of Ulphilas, S. Patrick, S. Columba, S. Augustine, and S. Boniface; and it has the same work to do which it had to do in their day and

generation; believers have to be confirmed in the faith, and the heathen have to be subdued to CHRIST. And if we would do the work they did, we must, nothing doubting, do it as they did. Africa is a field of labour, to which the Providence of God, by the discoveries of our countrymen, and the position we already occupy in it, seems to be directing the Church. Great sacrifices may be required of us before we may see the fruit of our labour in that land; but what of this? it has always been so with the followers of the Crucified, they cannot expect to accomplish a CHRIST-like work without first being made partakers of a CHRIST-like suffering. Oh! that England's Church would awake to the full sense of her position as a Missionary Church! Would that she could see it her duty to send out again and again to Africa, as well as to other heathen lands, the goodly band of devoted men with the saintly Bishop at their head, for the blessing that would accrue to her work at home would be incalculable. In the words of an eloquent writer on missions:

"The natives of the earth demand some recompense of us; and England owes a debt of penitence and restitution. And how shall it be paid, but by the Church lifting up her voice and stirring the nation to its duty, by letting it have no rest until she is enabled to bear the healing balm of the Gospel to the afflicted tribes; till she stand between the dead and the living, and the plague be stayed.

"And if God in His mercy stir up in us this spirit of penitence, and love, and zeal—that spirit which once made this country the isle of saints—how great may we believe will be the reflected blessing with which He will recompense the work! The spirit that undertakes the duty, and makes the sacrifice, will not be borne abroad and then given to the winds, but will be wafted back again, and distil in dew to refresh and revive the Church. Is it not ever thus, that compliance with known duty is blessed with an increase of spiritual power? And thus the sight of the Church flourishing in some distant land among tribes converted, civilized, disciplined, united, will bear witness to the graces still dwelling within it. Its power will be seen. This token of life will silence many a taunt, awaken perhaps many a tenderer regard; 'turn the hearts of the fathers unto the children,' and convince gainsayers 'that God is with us of a truth.' The faith of many will wax strong, and piety will burn brighter in the individual breast that has learned to sympathise in the salvation of the heathen. And the examples of 'men who have hazarded their lives for the Name of our LORD JESUS CHRIST,' will call forth a kindred spirit of sacrifice at home. They will chide the slumberer and self-indulgent. They will plead the cause of CHRIST with us. As we follow them, as it were, into the very dominion of Satan, and stand in the face of the great enemy of CHRIST, surely our animosities will be laid aside—our spirits, now estranged by jealousies, will be drawn together—our work at home will be consolidated and sanctified—and our Church may shine forth as it did in darker and less prosperous days, a light to the heathen, a mother of Churches, and a glory of all Christendom."

PEACOCK'S INVENTORIES OF CHURCH FURNITURE, 1566.

English Church Furniture, Ornaments, and Decorations, at the period of the Reformation, as exhibited in a list of the goods destroyed in certain Lincolnshire Churches, A.D. 1566. Edited by EDWARD PEACOCK, F.S.A., &c. London: Hotten. 1866.

MR. Peacock has given us a most important and timely work, of equal value to the antiquarian, and to the Ritualist. The principal portion of the book is taken up with inventories of the goods and furniture of 153 churches in the diocese of Lincoln in 1566. In that year there was a royal visitation of the diocese for the purpose of removing and destroying "monuments of superstition" in the various parish churches. The churches were visited, and an inventory made of the ornaments and furniture therein found; and such as were deemed superstitious were destroyed. The only portion of this inventory at present known to be in existence is that given here. The MS. is preserved among the miscellaneous papers in the Episcopal Registry at Lincoln. It has no other title than "*Inventorium Monumentorum Superstitionis*" written on the parchment cover. The greater part of the returns are the original inventories as given by the churchwardens themselves.

The appendix contains various documents connected with the subject. The first and second contain the earliest known complete lists of church goods. "They are," says Mr. Peacock, in his preface,

"the foundation of our present law as to the relative duties of rectors and parishioners in regard to the fabric of the church, and its ornaments. Spelman printed them upwards of two centuries ago, but they have not hitherto been published separately.¹

"The computus of the churchwardens of S. Mary's, Stamford, has remained in manuscript up to the present time; a translation was indeed published long since by Francis Peck, but that industrious antiquary has in several cases entirely failed to understand the original.

"The series of papers relative to the Boston guilds will, it is believed,

¹ Mr. Peacock does not seem to be aware that a translation of Gray's and Winchelsey's Constitutions was published in 1720 by Johnson in his "*Ecclesiastical Canons*;" reprinted in the Anglo-Catholic Library. With regard to Spelman's accuracy, that depends upon which of the three copies issued by Winchelsey is to be considered the best, for all three are authentic. Johnson in a note thus accounts for there being three: "I am humbly of opinion that Archbishop Winchelsey did thrice publish this Constitution; first in his provincial visitation . . . secondly, in this Council of Merton, in which he made considerable additions to it; thirdly, in some unknown council he finished it."—*Johnson's Canons*, vol. ii. p. 319.

have a peculiar interest to many persons, because they supply a singularly full description of the furniture of the church and guild chapels of an important town when the country was on the eve of the great Tudor revolution. To some of us they will have a far deeper attraction, from the faint gleam of light they throw on the town-life of the ancestors of those who founded the most illustrious of American cities." —P. 10.

The volume is enriched with four plates; a fresco executed towards the close of the fourteenth century, discovered on the wall of the church of Kirton-in-Lindsey. Its subject is the seven Sacraments. In the centre was a crucifixion with SS. Mary and John. From the wounds in the hands and feet flow streams of blood, which are directed to seven compartments, which make up the rest of the fresco; in each compartment is a representation of the administration of one of the Sacraments. The second is a portion of a hearse that once belonged to a tomb in the parish of Snarford. The third is the inscription on the hearse. The fourth is an Easter sepulchre at Navenby Church.

We shall now give a specimen of one of the inventories. We have modernised the spelling, and filled up the contractions; the latter would have required a special type.

"SPRINGTHORP. William Burie and George Swyfte, churchwardens, 8 April, 1566.

"Imprimis, the images of the rood Mary and John, and all other images of Papistry, were burnt anno Domini 1561, Robert Nailer and William Andrewe, churchwardens.

"Item: all our mass books, and other Papistical books, were burnt and cut in pieces by Sir Richard Robinson, our parson anno 1561.

"Item: one vestment sold to William Burre by Robert Nailer and William Andrew, churchwardens, anno 1561; and he hath cut it in pieces, and made cushions thereof.

"Item: one other vestment of silk cut in pieces, and a cloth made for our communion table.

"Item: the rood-loft taken down, and the boards thereof were nailed up at the east end of the church to keep out rain and wind; and the beams or posts thereof we have reserved to mend a common house in our town.

"Item: two candlesticks of wood, broken and burnt anno 1561; and one cross of wood.

"Item: one pix broken in pieces, and made away; and one chrismatory.

"Item: an old alb, cut in pieces and given to the poor people.

"Item: two banner cloths were burnt anno 1561.

"Item: two altar stones broken in pieces, and defaced, and paved.

"Item: one pax burnt, 1562.

"Item: one sepulchre burnt, 1561.

"Item: one holy water can, broken in pieces.

"As for other monuments of superstition we had none in Queen Mary's days, and that we will depose in a book.

"LINCOLN.

"JOHN AELMER, Archdeacon of Lincoln.

"GEORGE MOUNSON, Gentleman and Armiger.

"MARTIN HOLLINGWORTH.

"18 April, 1566."

In a foot-note we have this :

"The Parish Register here contains the following memorandum relating to the churchyard cross. It would seem that it was an act of lawless violence, not a sacrilege performed in obedience to authority :

"[1563] Rolandus Chambers de Kirton, et Mabella Wilson conubio juncti 22 Nov. : eademque nocte crux in cemeterio funditus eversa fuit."

"The same document informs us that 'Robertus Smyth occisus fuit a molitore quodam 19 Decem. [1562:]' and that between 3 August and 12 October, 1559, eleven persons died here of the plague.

"The Rev. Edwin C. L. Blenkinsopp, the present Rector, to whose courtesy I am indebted for the facts contained in the foregoing note, informs me that the fragments of one of the altar-slabs were found during the recent alterations in Springthorpe church. It is pleasant to be able to add that they have been restored to Christian uses. They now form a credence table."

The great importance of these inventories will be at once seen, when we consider that this Visitation took place in the eighth year of Queen Elizabeth's reign ; that the articles enumerated were not introduced in Queen Mary's time, but were the old furniture of the Church. To all appearance, they had been in use in the reign of King Edward VI. They therefore come under those rendered legal by the rubric—whatever its exact signification may imply—"in the Second Year of the Reign of King Edward the Sixth;" and when it is further considered that the articles above enumerated are similar to those mentioned in all the inventories of the 153 churches, with slight variations, we can hardly doubt that they were actually in regular use until the reign of Elizabeth. It is next to impossible that had they been illegal in Edward's reign they would have remained in all the churches. The destruction of some of them, as is testified by the churchwardens, took place in the first year of Queen Elizabeth, but none before then. Archdeacon Aelmer, whose name appears to most of those inventories, is John Aylmer, afterwards Bishop of London.

In the appendix, Mr. Peacock gives us two documents of great value ; the first is a decree of Walter Gray, Archbishop of York, and Lord Chancellor. He was translated to York in 1216, and died in 1255. The title of the decree is "De ornamentis Ecclesiæ quæ pertinent Rectoribus et quæ Parochianis in Provincia Ebor."

After reciting that disputes frequently arose between rectors and vicars on the one side, and the parishioners on the other, concerning the ornaments of the Church, and other ecclesiastical matters, especially that of providing and repairing the same; therefore it is fit that these things should be clearly understood and universally observed; accordingly a list is given: "*casula, alba munda, amictus, stola, manipulus, zona, cum tribus touuellis, corporalia, et alia vestimenta pro diacono et subdiacono honesta, juxta facultates parochianorum et ecclesiæ, cum cappa serica principali pro principalibus festis, et cum duabus aliis pro choris regendis in festis superdictis: crux processionalis, et alia crux minor pro mortuis, et feretrum pro mortuis: vas ad aquam benedictam, osculatorium, candelabrum ad cereum Paschale, thuribulum, lucerna, cum tintinabulo, velum quadragesimale, duo candelabra pro ceroferariis. De libris, legenda, antiphonale, graduale, psalterium, troparium, ordinale, missale, manuale; frontale ad magnum altare, tria superpellicia, paxis pro corpore Christi honesta: vexillum pro Rogationibus, campanæ magnæ cum chordis suis; fons sacer cum serura, chrismatorium, imagines in ecclesia.*" From what follows, it would seem that not only is the chancel with desks, seats, windows, &c., to be kept in repair by the rector or vicar, but also all the ornaments of the Church which are used in the chancel, "*ac aliis ornamentis honestis;*" which, of course, must include vestments: the providing of surplices, &c., by the parish is a later order. The nave and tower and churchyard only, it seems, belonged to the parishioners.

Robert Winchelsey, Archbishop of Canterbury, 1293—1313, issues a very similar decree, mentioning the like ornaments in very nearly the same words, with this difference as to repairs: that besides the body of the church, windows, and churchyard, the parishioners had to repair the pix and chrismatory. The rest of the furniture of the chancel, including books and "*other ornaments of the same,*" were to be repaired by the rector or vicar. It is to be noted that no distinction is made between rector and vicar, nor is Appropriator mentioned at all. That these decrees constituted the law of the Church up to the death of Henry VIII., no one will deny; and not only were they law in the ecclesiastical courts, they were also embodied in the Act of Parliament 25 Hen. VIII. c. 19, and thus became the law of the civil courts, in the same degree as the various Acts of Uniformity. The words of the statute run thus: "*Several of the old canons and constitutions being complained of, as prejudicial to the prerogative royal, burdensome to the people, and contrary to the statutes of the realm, it is therefore enacted, that the king shall have power and authority to assign two-and-thirty persons, sixteen of the clergy, and sixteen of the laity, to examine, abrogate, or confirm the canons as they thought fit. Till such a review was made, all those canons, which are not contrary to the laws or prerogative, were to remain in force.*"

Now since this commission never carried out its objects, and no reformation of the canon law was made, all the ancient canons remain in force to this present day, excepting such as have been repealed by subsequent legislation: and no such legislation having taken place up to the passing of the Act of Uniformity in the third year of Edward VI., it seems clear that the decrees of Archbishops Winchelsey and Gray were those in use "by the authority of Parliament in the second year of King Edward VI."

Further, let it be noted, that even supposing that the Act of Uniformity of 3 Edw. VI. be, as the Judicial Committee in the *S. Barnabas* case decided it was, the one referred to in the rubric on ornaments, that Act could only affect the ornaments of the ministers, and not of the church: for there is nothing said of the latter at all. Still further; in the rubric in the Book of 1559, when ornaments are first mentioned, there is nothing said about those of the *ministers*, only "ornaments in the *church*." The revisers of 1661 were more precise, for they specify both "ornaments of the church, and of the ministers thereof."

The question then is narrowed to this point; supposing that the Act of Edw. VI. be the one referred to in the rubric, then it relates solely to the vestments of the celebrant and his assistants, for no others are mentioned: in which case, the decrees of the two Archbishops, as confirmed by the Act 25 Hen. VIII., are in full force as regards the ornaments of the church: at the same time the Act of Uniformity prescribes the ornaments of the *ministry*. Again; the Act 3 Edw. VI., does not repeal any former statute, nor does it add to, or subtract from any; it merely enforces what had been prescribed before; as such it strengthens, rather than weakens, the previous law.

When we bear in mind what we mentioned above, that ornaments both of the ministry and of the church, as prescribed by the two Archbishops, were found in all the churches visited by the Royal Visitors in the eighth year of Queen Elizabeth, that is, that they continued in the churches during the whole reign of King Edward VI., it amounts to a certainty, that they were not, in his reign, considered to be abolished. It will be borne in mind that the Book of 1559 preceded the visitation by seven years, up to which time, apparently, the ornaments were in use.

A remarkable feature in the lists given by the two Archbishops is the absence of any mention of the altar crucifix or cross, and indeed of any altar candlesticks, excepting incidentally in connection with "*lucerna*:" and even then it is doubtful if these candles were altar candles, for in Archbishop Gray's list, there are required "*duo candelabra pro ceroferariis*," which, of course, required candles. These omissions can only be accounted for by supposing that they were considered to be indispensable, that there was no need to enumerate them, there being no dispute regarding

the providing of them, between the parish priests and their parishioners.

In examining the Inventories with respect to colours, we find no regularity in the smaller parish churches; they seem to have complied with the Archbishops' decrees, and provided a "vestment" for celebrations, and a cope for processions, without regard for colour. The parish priests were probably too poor to provide a complete set. In the Boston Inventories we have abundance of colours; besides white, red, violet, green, and black, we read of "tawny," and "blew." Most of them seem to have been presents from laymen and women, sometimes ornamented in a way we should not like to see resumed: "a vestment of tawny damask with eagles standing on books, with this letter M crowned with an orphrey of red velvet, of the gift of Mr. John Robinson, and having his arms upon it, with all other things to the said vestment belonging."

We should have much liked to give our readers an account of the Boston Guilds, and their belongings; but as the inventory of vestments and of chapel furniture extends over thirteen pages, we must refer our readers to the book itself.

In speaking of the Easter sepulchre, (p. 28,) Mr. Peacock makes two mistakes; he says, "The sepulchre was used in the latter days of Passion Week;" he means Holy Week: and "on Holy Thursday the celebrating priest consecrated three hosts; one which he had to receive on that day, another for use on Good Friday, when no mass was said;" he means, when no consecration took place, for the mass of the Pre-sanctified is always said on that day.

THE CONSCIENCE CLAUSE.

THE present time, when a new ministry, unfettered by the traditions of the last few years, has just succeeded to office, seems to be a fitting opportunity for united action amongst Churchmen in endeavouring to prevail upon the Committee of Council on Education to abandon the imposition of a Conscience Clause in the Trust Deeds of Church Schools as a necessary condition for the reception of building grants. The subject is not a new one, and it has been well and ably canvassed already. Canon Trevor's article in the "Church and the World" is a most able *résumé* of its history; and the Archbishop of Canterbury, in his correspondence with Lord Granville just published, has vindicated the freedom of the clergy in a manner worthy of his exalted position; but still it is a subject which needs constant agitation until our grievance is redressed.

We are in danger of letting it sleep, because, in its present form, its inconvenience is practically felt by very few. In most parishes Church schools already exist, in which liberty to teach the doctrines of the Church is protected by their trust deeds. The grievance falls, at present, only on Churchmen who are anxious to found Church schools, but whose efforts are discouraged by the imposition of a Conscience Clause as the condition of obtaining that aid which is rendered by the State to schools of other denominations without any such restriction.

As an act of sympathy with the oppressed it is our duty to unite in the demand for the abolition of a grievance to which we are not ourselves at present subject. In the holy cause of justice it is our duty to protest against an infringement of the liberty of the founders of Church schools from which Dissenters are exempt; but as an act of policy we must look on a little ahead, and then we shall see that this present grievance is only the thin end of the wedge, and that the Conscience Clause, which is now the condition of a building grant, will in time be extended to the annual capitation grant. Thus it will affect us all, and the liberty of the managers of all Church schools will be abridged. Lord Granville stated as much in his evidence before the Select Committee of the House of Commons, when he said "that if a reasonable Conscience Clause were laid down, it would be very desirable to make it a condition both of building and of annual grants." Now if the Conscience Clause imposes restrictions to which we as Churchmen cannot subject ourselves, we must use all legitimate means to nip it in its bud, before it assumes a form which will deprive all our schools of the annual assistance which they now receive from the State.

It may be said that we are protected by our existing trust deeds, which place the religious instruction under the direction of the clergyman of the parish, and provide that the children shall be educated according to the principles of the Church of England; but an Act of Parliament might change all this, and it would be with an ill grace at best that we should resist the application of the Conscience Clause to the annual grants, when we had allowed it in the case of building grants. The advocates of the Conscience Clause might go to Parliament for an Act with some colour of justice in their claim when they could point out the anomaly which would exist from the fact that whilst in one parish the children of Dissenters might claim exemption from religious instruction, there was a school in the next parish in which the rule of Church teaching was rigidly preserved, owing to its having been founded before the Conscience Clause was invented. Such an inequality would not long be tolerated, and either the Conscience Clause must be abandoned, or else it must be made the rule of every parish school alike.

We will further assert that in the imposition of the Conscience Clause the Committee of Council on Education have committed a distinct breach of faith, both with the Church and the nation. If we look back to its early history, which is apt to be forgotten in the discussion, this will be evident. Grants of public money for the encouragement of the education of the poor commenced in 1833, and were for some time administered by the Lords of the Treasury. They were then distributed in building grants to schools in union with the National Society and the British and Foreign School Society. In the year 1839 an order in council transferred the disposal of their grants from the Treasury to a Committee of Privy Council. It was then that Lord Russell struck out a scheme of education which contemplated a central board of education with a central State training college for teachers, and a model school, in which children of all religions were to be educated together, and the religious instruction was to be supplemented by ministers of all persuasions. The utmost alarm was aroused throughout the country, and the "comprehensive scheme" was opposed not only by the National Society, but by the British and Foreign School Society and the Wesleyans. The Committee were obliged to modify their scheme, and abandon the State schools altogether; but even then the indefinite powers vested in the Committee were opposed in both houses of Parliament. In the House of Lords an address was moved by Archbishop Howley, and carried by a majority of 229 to 118, to cancel the appointment of the Committee of Council; whilst in the House of Commons, Lord Stanley (now Lord Derby) moved a similar address, which was lost by only five votes. Throughout the debate, however, no hint was dropped of any change to be effected in the power of school managers. Lord Russell stated that "no change was contemplated in the religious instruction in schools. He did not suppose that it would at all interfere, or at all oppose the instruction under the National and the British and Foreign School Societies; for their plans and regulations would remain precisely as at present, so far as this vote was concerned. He certainly conceived that with respect to the National Society, if this vote did pass, he should be bound to conform with the rules laid down with respect to any sums granted to that Society."

The debate then was whether public money should be granted for any religious education but that of the Church, and not whether any interference should be effected with the power of the Church in her own schools. Mr. Gladstone argued that "to permit the Government to combine education with the religion of all forms indifferently was a new and unconstitutional principle, and denied that this was involved in the previous grant to the British and Foreign School Society, inasmuch as the Society professed no doctrine contrary to the Church, and that many Church of England

children were educated in their schools." Lord Shaftesbury opposed the Government scheme in words which apply with special force to the present aspect of the Conscience Clause. "If the children," he said, "were to be taught this general religion together, and in open school, and then taken asunder for special instruction in the tenets of each, could that," he asked, "have a beneficial effect on the children? Could it be beneficial to be told so early in life that religious opinions were so shifting and varying that some might be taught one thing and some another; there was no certainty whatever, and that the instruction given in one place was the reverse of the instruction in another? He would imagine a case which might easily occur. He would imagine three children sitting side by side, one a member of the Church of England, another the child of Socinian parents, and the third a child born of Jewish parents. Let these three children read together in school, during the time of general instruction, some particular portion of the Bible, suppose the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah. Let those children be taken away immediately after, for the purpose of special instruction, each from his own minister. What would be the effect on the minds of those three children? The child of the Church of England would learn the great, necessary, and saving truths in which nine tenths of the community agree. The Socinian child would be taught that which the Church of England child believed was most gross error, and that the person to whom the prophecy referred was, in fact, no better than a mere man. But the Jewish child was taught to believe that the whole thing, from first to last, was an absolute imposition. It was impossible that these children could think any belief established or certain. The result would be universal scepticism, or an universal belief that there was nothing necessary, nothing certain. It was a new thing for the State to undertake to teach contradictions."¹

Although the Committee of Council retained its existence then, it did so on the express understanding that the religious teaching in Church schools was not to be interfered with, and that the annual vote was to be distributed on the same principles as it had been hitherto. Dissenters, as such, were allowed no claim on the public money, and the State schools were distinctly prohibited. In spite of this clear understanding, the Committee of Council are now attempting to convert Church schools into the very thing that they contemplated in the proposed State schools, which they were compelled to abandon.

Hitherto the Church and State theory had been acted on, which acknowledged the duty of the State to promote the education of the poor in the principles of the Church of England, and in no other, but this rule was relaxed when it was seen that a large proportion of those who contributed to the Education Grant were

¹ Hansard's Parl. Deb. vol. xlviii. 279.

dissenters, and that they, as well as churchmen, were zealous in building schools for their own children. We have not a word to say against the relaxation of this principle which admitted dissenters to a share in the public grants. First, Wesleyans and Roman Catholics, and then Jews were admitted to a participation in the public money, and the management of their schools in respect to religious instruction was left to the managers without any restriction whatever.

The Committee of Council commenced their operations by the manufacture of Trust Deeds, but in these a Conscience Clause was only suggested in the case of schools not in union either with the National or the British and Foreign School Society. For a parish school founded by a spiritual corporation solely, not only was no Conscience Clause provided, but an express proviso was inserted, that "*all the children were to be educated in the principles of the Christian religion, according to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, such education to be under the superintendence and direction of the rector or vicar.*"

In 1846 the application of the vote for educational purposes was extended to annual grants. The discussion which we all remember respecting the management clauses then arose, but on this there is no occasion now to enter, inasmuch as the controversy turned on the general rights of management rather than on the special question of religious instruction. Every one of the clauses provided for schools in union with the National Society contained a proviso that they should always be in union with and conducted according to the principles of that Society.

It will be remembered that the original terms of union with the National Society provided that all children educated in their schools should be assembled on Sundays and taken to church. Practically this had ceased to be invariably enforced, as indeed it could scarcely be in all cases alike, since the parents of some children might prefer taking them to church themselves. The National Society had contented itself with stating a rule which it possessed no power to enforce, and left its application to the discretion of the clergy. But while some sought an abolition of the rule in order that the Society might sanction the admission of dissenting children to all the secular benefits of the education provided in their schools, and leave them free to attend dissenting meeting-houses and dissenting schools on Sunday, Archdeacon Denison and the party which acted with him demanded that the rule should be enforced with greater strictness than before. The Society adopted a middle course, and whilst it refused to rescind its rule, declined to interfere with the discretion of the parochial minister beyond referring the point to the consideration of the bishops. This was considered at the time a "*happy arrangement,*" and most of those who had taken part in the controversy were now satisfied.

The dissenters, however, had gained what they wanted, the advantage of education in the Church schools, with the privilege of unteaching their children on Sunday all the religious instruction which they had learnt during the week.

Looking at the compromise from this advance of time, different opinions may legitimately be held respecting its policy. For ourselves we regret it, because we think that if the National Society had held its original ground, no Conscience Clause would ever have been attempted, but still we are free to admit that much may be said in its favour. Some children have, no doubt, been reclaimed to the Church by the instruction which they received on the week-day, but still we think that if the rule had been strictly enforced, when the education afforded by the Church was really of a superior kind, few parents would have objected to their children being taken to church on Sunday. It certainly seems an anomaly that children should be taught one doctrine on weekdays and another on Sundays, and this anomaly gives some colour of justice to the Conscience Clause which seeks to remove it.

The first school on which a Conscience Clause was attempted to be enforced was at Llanelly. There the population contained a majority of dissenters who had already four schools in operation. The churchmen of the place desired to found a school for Church children and applied to the Committee of Council for a grant under the ordinary conditions of the National Society. The Council consulted the secretary of the British and Foreign School Society, and, finding that there was still room in their schools, replied by denying the necessity of a Church school at all. The Llanelly churchmen, pressing their claim, were subjected to a Conscience Clause to which most unfortunately they submitted. The next step of the Committee of Council was to require a violation of their own management clause, whereby dissenters were excluded from the management of Church schools. This was too much even for the Llanelly churchmen, and on their refusal to submit to this fresh interference, the grant was refused in May 1860. These were the circumstances under which the Conscience Clause was first invented, and it is not too much to say that it was a violation of faith on the part of the Committee of Council both with Parliament and with the Church.

Lord Granville stated in his letter to Mr. Hubbard in 1864 that if the parish were composed entirely of churchmen, or if the population were sufficiently numerous to admit of two schools, and the grant asked was only for a school sufficient to accommodate the children belonging to the Church of England, the Conscience Clause would not be insisted on; but in the Llanelly case the dissenters were already amply supplied with schools, and the churchmen only wanted a school for the education of their own children, and yet the grant was refused. It is hard to fix the

Committee of Council to anything, as they have a convenient method of evading every engagement which they make. Supposing that Lord Granville's letter was a *bonâ fide* statement of the principles which were intended to guide the administration of grants, "my Lords" have an ingenious method of so applying it that no parish can possibly satisfy their requirements. They reckon the number of dissenters in a parish, not by those who frequent dissenting meetings, but by those who absent themselves from Church. On this principle a grant for an exclusively Church school might be refused, where there was not a single dissenting meeting in the parish.

The plea on which the Conscience Clause is based is the protection of a Dissenting minority in a parish, but why is not a Church minority entitled to similar protection? Let us mark the inequality of the rule. If a Wesleyan, Roman Catholic, or British and Foreign school is founded in a parish, no Conscience Clause is required. Dissenters are at liberty to educate children attending their schools according to their own principles, but in Church schools only the religious education is to be interfered with. The reason for this difference is instructive. When the Conscience Clause was first proposed to the National Society, it was intended to apply to schools of all denominations. The clause was then as follows: "The persons authorised to manage the school shall be bound to make such orders as shall provide for admitting to the benefits of the school, the children of parents not in communion with the Church (or denomination with which the school is connected,) but such orders shall be confined to the exemption of such children, if their parents desire it, from attendance at the public worship, and from instruction in the doctrines and formularies of the said Church (or denomination,) and shall not otherwise interfere with the religious teaching of the scholars as fixed by their parents, or as the case may be, and shall not authorise any other religious instruction to be given in the school."

A few months afterwards the Clause was issued again without any mention of other denominations besides the Church, for the Committee of Council had discovered in the interim that Dissenters would not accept a Clause which interfered with the freedom of their religious teaching. They knew that if the Dissenters united with the Church, as they had done before in their opposition to the State schools, such united opposition would be too strong for them, and therefore they prudently dropped out of the Conscience Clause its application to schools of other denominations in order to gain Dissenters to their side. It is not too much then to say that if Churchmen would assert their freedom with the same boldness that Dissenters do, they would not be troubled with an interference which is not attempted in the case of Dissenting schools.

If the Conscience Clause were admitted, what would be the

residuum of religious teaching permissible? How could even the Bible remain a text book when the Socinian would object to all reference to our Blessed LORD's Divinity? The Jew would refuse to allow his child to read the New Testament, and would object to all application of the types and prophecies of the Old Testament to our Blessed LORD. The Roman Catholic might object to the use of the authorised translation. The Sunday league man would cut out the fourth, and the Mormon the seventh commandment. The Universalist would disapprove of all allusion to a future retribution; whilst the Atheist and the Secularist would take a wider sweep, and in the midst of all these contending objections, the religious instruction permitted would become a *reductio ad nihilum*. After all, religious education cannot be confined to the Scripture lesson. Education, if it is worth anything at all, means more than simple instruction in reading, writing, and arithmetic. It includes the inculcation of right principles of morality, and the training of children in habits of reflection and thought. The reading lesson, or the history and geography lesson, may suggest something of a religious nature which the conscientious teacher will not choose to be deprived of the liberty of making use of. Religious instruction cannot be so entirely divorced from secular as Lord Granville thinks possible, and certainly the Archbishop of Canterbury has had the best of the argument in the recent correspondence which has been published. There is no time or occasion at which the clergyman or the schoolmaster ought to be deprived of the liberty of making a remark or asking a question which he considers the circumstances may call forth. If the Conscience Clause were admitted, religious instruction would not only be cast out of Church schools, but would be relegated to Dissenting schools where the teaching was unfettered. The religious-minded parent, who, like most of the religious poor, had little definite idea of Church authority, would not unnaturally prefer the teaching of the Dissenting school.

But the main question, after all, is, whether the clergy of the Church of England, who are charged with the management of their parochial schools, could conscientiously submit to the imposition of a Conscience Clause. Such an admission would, we think, be inconsistent with their ordination vows. At the most solemn hour of their lives they promised that they would "teach the people committed to their charge with all diligence to keep and observe the doctrine and sacraments and discipline of CHRIST, as the LORD hath commanded, and as this Church and Realm hath received the same;" but the Committee of Council forbids them to teach this to the children who are educated in the schools placed under their charge. They promise, moreover, that they "will be ready with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away all erroneous and strange doctrines contrary to God's Word;" but the Committee of Council bids them connive at the instruction of the

children in those very things which they promised to banish and drive away. We cannot therefore understand how a conscientious clergyman can receive a State grant subject to conditions which are so manifestly inconsistent with his ordination vow. That the clergy do as a body refuse grants to which the condition of the Conscience Clause is annexed, is proved by the fact that in two years £60,000 have been saved in consequence of the Committee of Council insisting on conditions which the founders of Church schools could not conscientiously accept. Private munificence may have done much; but yet no one can deny that the progress of education has been stopped in its course by that very body of men who were charged with the office of promoting it. Surely Churchmen have some right to share in grants of public money to which they contribute in larger proportion than Dissenters, but now they are practically excluded from all participation by the rules of the Council Office which have never received the sanction of Parliament.

There are several opponents of the existing Conscience Clause, amongst whom the Dean of Ely is one, who think that some sort of Conscience Clause may be desirable. For ourselves we cannot think that any is needed. The "happy arrangement" of the National Society, as it has been termed, seems to meet, and more than meet, all that can reasonably be demanded. The Secretary of the British and Foreign School Society, who has devoted more than twenty years to the subject of elementary education amongst the poor, when asked if he knew any cases in which hardship and injustice had arisen from the want of a Conscience Clause, replied in his evidence before the select committee, "I cannot call to mind at this particular moment cases." If such cases had really existed, it is reasonable to suppose that the secretary would have refreshed his memory with them before he went before the committee to give evidence on this very point. We have heard of many imaginary cases, but of very few real cases, in which the teaching of the Church school has been objected to by the parents.

By all means let Dissenters have schools of their own, and let them benefit as much as possible by participation in the national grants, but why should the founders of Church schools be deprived of all aid by the imposition of conditions to which they cannot conscientiously accede? We must appeal to common sense and to justice, to the public and to Parliament, for the redress of our grievance, for protection from the unconstitutional tyranny of my Lords of Council, and for the same measure of justice as is accorded to Dissenters.

If the Dissenting minority in a parish has a grievance, because they are too poor or have too little zeal to found and support schools of their own, are there not also 11,000 parishes which receive no aid from government for educational purposes because

they cannot raise the means to satisfy the preliminary conditions which are needful for a grant?

We conclude therefore that the imposition of a Conscience Clause must be opposed on the following grounds:

I. It is a violation of faith on the part of the Committee of Council both with the Church and with Parliament.

II. It imposes a condition which no churchman can accept.

III. It is a gratuitous and wholly uncalled for insult to the Church, inasmuch as the education of Dissenters is as well provided for as that of the Church.

IV. It is unjust to interfere with the liberty of the Church in the instruction of her children, while no restraint is imposed in respect to Dissenting schools: in a word, to make it lawful to teach error, but unlawful to teach truth.

V. We must consider that it is the avowed purpose of the Committee of Council to extend the application of the Conscience Clause to annual grants, as soon as circumstances permit, which would deprive many existing schools of all aid whatever, and that any measure short of this would be inconsistent and anomalous.

VI. The interference with the teaching of the clergy in their parochial schools suggests other dangers too numerous to recite, such as educational rates administered by boards of guardians, and eventually, perhaps, if the claim of Dissenters to the use of Church schools is admitted, a similar claim will be made to the use of our parish churches themselves.

For these several reasons we must not relax our most strenuous efforts for the preservation of our liberties, and for demanding that justice which the Committee of Council refuses.

ON THE PROPHETICAL OFFICE.

THERE are few questions more frequently asked in our parish schools, and none more glibly and uniformly answered than this, "What is a prophet?" "One who foretells things to come." So it is defined in such books as "Cruden's Concordance." But in spite of the satisfaction with which the answer is received, it is entirely wrong, and the parent, also, of much misconception and error, because of course it implies that the office has long since ceased to exist in the Church.

We propose, then, to devote this article to a consideration of the subject, and will begin with ascertaining the recognised meaning of the term as defined by the ordinary lexicographer. The following is a condensation of the account of the word given by Liddell and

cott :—" *προφήτης*, strictly, one who speaks for another, especially one who speaks for God, and interprets His will to man ; a prophet : so Apollo was Jove's interpreter. Thus again, the *προφήτης* is the interpreter of the words of the inspired *μάντις* ; so, also, poets are called *μουσῶν προφῆται*, interpreters of the muses ; in general, an announcer or proclaimer.

"2. Not till later did the word assume our sense of a prophet or seer, *μάντις* being the classical word for this.

"3. In the New Testament and in ecclesiastical writers, an interpreter of Scripture, a preacher."

Bacon and Jeremy Taylor, it is well known, both use the word "prophesying" in the sense of exposition, and even Locke, in his paraphrase of 1 Cor. xii., could say that "Prophecy comprehends three things—prediction ; singing by the dictate of the SPIRIT ; and understanding and explaining the mysterious hidden sense of Scripture by immediate illumination and motion of the SPIRIT." Nevertheless, it was in the seventeenth century, Dean Stanley tells us, "in consequence of an etymological mistake," that the word acquired the narrow meaning (which is really merely an accident) of prediction. "Etymologically it is certain that neither prescience nor prediction are implied by the term used in the Hebrew, Greek, or English language."¹

And as we are now on the etymology of the word, it would appear to be the place for noting that there is yet another shade of meaning which the prefix seems to convey, derived from the primary sense of the preposition *πρό*, "forth, or forward," as though a prophet were one who speaks with special confidence in consideration of the commission which he bears : so it was observed of our LORD that "He taught as one having authority, and not as the scribes." We admit that we have no authority to adduce for this view ; but we think that it will commend itself to many of our readers.

We will now proceed to trace the use of the word in Holy Scripture, first premising that though there are three Hebrew words used to indicate seer or prophet, there is not any very clear distinction to be made between them. It is first of all applied to Abraham (Gen. xx. 7,) as an interpreter of God's will ; and in his sense, also, doubtless, Moses is called a prophet (Deut. xviii. 15 ;) for it can hardly be said that foretelling future events was a characteristic of his work. So, also, Aaron was appointed by God to be Moses' prophet : "Aaron thy brother shall be thy prophet. Thou shalt speak all that I command thee ; and Aaron thy brother shall speak unto Pharaoh." (Ex. vii. 1, 2.) In the same sense Eldad and Medad are reported to have "prophesied" (Numbers

¹ Smith's Dictionary of the Bible *in loco*. This is a really good article, and contrasts most favourably with a wretched article by Mr. Plumtre, of King's College, in the correlative term of Priest.

xi. 27,) i.e., to have received an *afflatus* for speaking in God's Name. In the same sense we must also interpret what is written concerning Enoch the seventh from Adam, "prophesying" to the people of his day (S. Jude 14.)

2. The next sense of the word, which plainly seems to be its secondary sense, is derived from the manner in which the inspired utterances of the Prophet were delivered. This would appear always to have been in a sustained or artificial voice. Hence the term of incantation which was used in connection with sorcerers or magicians who pretended to have received the divine *afflatus*, equally with the prophets of God, and so copied their manner. Subsequently, in the time of Samuel we read of a musical accompaniment: the prophets "came down from the high place with a psaltery, and a tabret, and a pipe, and a harp before them; and they did prophesy," (1 Sam. x. 5.) So "Saul also prophesied among them," (v. 10.) It is this musical utterance, it need scarcely be said, which has been handed down in the traditional "intonation" of the Christian Church.

3. There has ever of necessity mingled with these inspired utterances a sense of prediction. God can hardly speak without reference to a future of rewards or punishments, either in this life or the world to come. So Enoch, and Noah, and Lot, and Moses, had to mingle frequent threats with the messages severally delivered by them. And this feature is inseparable from the address of the modern preacher: he has to speak of the coming of the Lord to be the recompense of His saints and the avenger of His violated laws.

But most of all is this the essential character of those *writings* which have come down to us from the prophets. Such among them as spoke only to their own generations respectively would not ordinarily be instructed to commit what they delivered to writing. In this way we have not preserved to us any writings of Elijah or Elisha, of Gad or Nathan, of Huldah "the prophetess," of many whose names only are recorded in Holy Scripture, and of the many more, nameless ones, who were trained in the school of the prophets. They served God in their generation, and their mission did not extend further: their names are written nevertheless in the Book of Life, and they will be known at the last great day as forming part of "the goodly Fellowship of the Prophets." They may be included also among those by whom the Nicene Creed declares that the "HOLY GHOST spake;" although that article may specially be understood as referring to the Inspired authors of the Sacred Volume. In this sense Job, Joshua, Solomon, Ezra, and S. Paul, are to be considered "Prophets," just as much as Moses, and David, and Isaiah.

4. We come now to a point of considerable importance, which has been the battle-field among several modern English writers,—

but has not, in our judgment, been satisfactorily treated by any,—we mean the relation existing between the Priestly and the Prophe-tical Office.

These two offices are of course in themselves essentially distinct : and if we gain clear ideas in respect of the one, we shall be able more readily to understand the other. A better definition of the priest's office than S. Paul's cannot be found : "a priest is one taken from among men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sin." This is the one function of the priest, the offering of sacrifice ; as this was the primal want of man after his fall, the making atonement for sin. For the general guidance of men, the traditions of Paradise would seem to have sufficed ; while in special cases, God was wont to commu-nicate His will through the instrumentality of dreams : "God speaketh once, yea twice, yet man perceiveth it not. In a dream, in a vision of the night, when deep sleep falleth upon men, in slumberings upon the bed ; then He openeth the ears of men, and sealeth their instruction." (Job xxxiii. 14.) Still in great emer-gencies men were wont to resort to the seer, from whom they were able to learn the will of God.

"Beforetime in Israel when a man went to inquire of God, thus he spake, Come and let us go to the seer." (1 Sam. ix. 9.) When God vouchsafed a new Revelation and Ritual to His Church by Moses a change was introduced in this matter. During his own lifetime Moses himself was the Prophet of Israel ; and so God con-tinued to vouchsafe direct communication to Joshua and the Judges. To the people in general, however, there was a provision made in the Urim and Thummim, that were set in the breast-plate of the priest. Thus there seemed to be intended a union between the priestly and prophetic offices ; but we have scarcely any traces of the use of this institution, nor are we able very well to understand the method of its operation. Generally it was true no doubt at all times that the priests' lips were to keep knowledge, and that men were directed "to seek the law at their mouth," (Malachi ii. 7,) yet do the Israelites appear more and more to have depended for instruction on the order of prophets, who, it is well known, were formally organised by Samuel—receiving both a special organisation, and being placed in different parts of the country, so that they might readily be consulted by the people.

Henceforward the prophets were a co-ordinate authority with the priesthood—distinct from it and not confined to any single tribe, and sometimes (as in the case of Amos, ch. i. 1,) not even having been trained to the office.

And here arises a question singularly illustrating the remark that we made of this question being made a battle-field for contro-versial discussion.

We will begin with Dr. Stanley, whose general purpose all our

readers know is to throw¹ discredit on the ecclesiastical system both of Jewish and Christian times; and who in his capacity of Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Oxford, laid a long train by beginning his Lectures with the Patriarchal era, and has dished up the same materials in the "Dictionary of the Bible," to which he was unfortunately allowed to contribute all the historical articles.

We read in 1 Sam. vii. 9, that Samuel "took a sucking lamb and offered it for a burnt-offering wholly unto the LORD." It is this statement which affords the *motif* to all that Dean Stanley has written on this portion of Jewish History. "The descent of Elkanah, (he tells us,) is involved in great obscurity. In 1 Sam. i. 1, he is described as an Ephraimite. In 1 Chron. vi. 22, he is made a descendant of Korah the Levite. Hengstenberg and Ewald explain this by supposing that the Levites were occasionally incorporated into other tribes amongst whom they dwelt. The question, however, is of no practical importance, because even if Samuel were a Levite, he certainly was not a Priest by descent." (Dictionary of the Bible *in loco*.) In other words, Dr. Stanley thinks he has discovered a fact which must be subversive alike of sacerdotal caste and sacerdotal commission. We do not find that Dr. Stanley anywhere refers to the remarkable statement in 1 Chron. ix. 22, that the various officers of the temple (if we may use the anachronism) were "reckoned by their genealogy in their villages, whom David and Samuel the Seer did ordain in their set office." In the next edition of his Lectures he will perhaps explain how this is consistent with the "anti-sacerdotal character" which he attributes to him.

We will now quote the comment made upon this fact by Archdeacon Wordsworth in his recently published volume on the two Books of Samuel. He admits the allegation that Samuel was not a priest, and thus characteristically deals with it.

"Samuel, it is true, was not a Priest, but only a Levite, and he performed priestly acts in various places. But his case was altogether extraordinary. He had an express commission from GOD to do what he did; and the anomalous and exceptional character of the times in which he lived and acted, gave a peculiar reason for this extraordinary commission from GOD.

"Almighty GOD is the only Author and Governor of every Priesthood, whether Patriarchal, Aaronic, or Christian. All the authority, by which the Priests of His Church have acted, now act, or ever will act, is derived from Him alone. His Priests are only instruments in

¹ The well-known skill of Dr. Stanley in accumulating insinuations against things revered is well illustrated in this article. In the first paragraph he contrives to throw doubt on the authenticity of the Pentateuch and on the two Books of Samuel. In the second he calls attention to the circumstance of GOD seeming to allow of polygamy. In the third he tries to overthrow the exclusiveness of the Aaronic Priesthood.

His hands. He is the Sovereign Agent who works by them. They are channels of grace which flows from Him Who is its only source.

"It is God's ordinary will and desire, that men should receive grace, by means of those instruments and channels which He appoints for the dispensing and conveying it; and that they should receive it at the places, and in the manner of His divine appointment. Men are tied to the use of the means which God appoints; but God's power is not tied to the means which are appointed by Him. And though the human instruments and channels may fail, yet the Divine Agent and Source never fails. Nay, rather, the working of His Almighty power, and the abundance of His exhaustless love, are more magnified in days of human degeneracy; and it is then most clearly shown, that God is the Almighty Agent and the Only Source of all grace to all.

"This is precisely what *was* manifested in the days of Samuel. He had received a call from God, when he was ministering as a child before the Ark, in the Tabernacle at Shiloh. But, for the sins of the People and the Priesthood, the Ark was taken, the Tabernacle was removed, and Shiloh was dismantled and destroyed. And during the whole time of Samuel, the Ark was never again united to the Tabernacle. The reason for bringing the sacrifices to the door of the Tabernacle was set aside by the removal of the Ark, which was the very heart and soul of the Tabernacle. The Tabernacle had become like a cenotaph. There was *no one place* to which sacrifices *could* be brought in compliance with the Levitical Law. It was not till after Samuel's death that the Law revived. The Ark was brought up by David to Mount Zion; but it was not till the Temple was built on Moriah, and the Ark was settled in it by Solomon, that the requirements of the Levitical Law, prescribing that sacrifices should be brought to the place which the Lord had chosen, *could* take effect.

"Then the Law awoke, and after this choice of a place was made by God, and the Ark was settled there, then the offering of sacrifice in any other place, and by any other hands, than those of the family of Aaron (except by God's express commission) was contrary to God's will. Such an act would have been like the gainsaying of Korah. Such was the sin of Jeroboam. Hence, also, the punishment of Uzziah the king of Judah, smitten with leprosy, for presuming to perform a priestly act, namely, to burn incense.

"Yet further. The offering of sacrifices in *different* places by Samuel, who was not a priest, and the favourable acceptance of those sacrifices by God, served another very important purpose of the highest kind. It not only showed God's supremacy, and man's subordination to Him, but it was preparatory to another higher and more spiritual dispensation, that of the Gospel, and of the priesthood of CHRIST. It weaned the minds of the faithful Israelites from dwelling on any one place in their own land, as the centre of the Visible Church, or from regarding one earthly family among themselves, such as that of Aaron, as the only priestly Ministry of God's Sanctuary. It prepared them for the transfer of the priesthood from Aaron to CHRIST, and for the universal diffusion of God's grace, and for the universal extension of His kingdom, in the days of the Messiah, when 'in every place incense would be offered to His Name, and a pure offering.'

"Thus the priesthood of Samuel was preparatory to the priesthood of CHRIST. The prophetic declaration of God Himself to Eli, the priest, at Shiloh, when the Tabernacle was profaned by his sons, was, 'I will raise Me up a *faithful priest*, that shall do according to that which is in My heart, and in My mind, and I will build him a *sure house*, and he shall walk before Mine Anointed *for ever*.' This prophecy had indeed a preparatory accomplishment in Samuel, who was not of the family of Aaron, and who was specially raised up by God, in days of priestly degeneracy, to do priestly acts; and it had another fulfilment afterwards in Zadok; but it reached its consummation in CHRIST, Who was not of the seed of Aaron, or of the tribe of Levi, and Who was raised up by God, when the Jewish Church and priesthood were lying in degradation and confusion, and Who joined the priesthood and the kingdom in one everlasting bond of union, in Himself."—Pp. ix. x.

On the other hand Mr. Meyrick in the article before referred to, assails the fundamental position assumed by Dr. Stanley (happily the "Dictionary of the Bible" not unfrequently refutes itself) and maintains that Samuel was "almost certainly a priest." Of course if this be so, the difficulty is removed; but it seems to us to be incumbent on Mr. Meyrick to show how the succession to the priesthood can have come through Gershom who was the ancestor of Samuel, and not through Kohath, the elder son of Levi, who was Aaron's progenitor.

But the point that we are concerned with is to show that it was quite within the scope of the prophet's office to act at times as priest, seeing that he possessed authority in every relation, whether ecclesiastical or civil, as the representative of God. We give two examples, derived, as we should say now, from the history of the Church and State respectively. (1) It was the Prophet Samuel who effected the great political revolution of changing Israel from a Theocratic aristocracy, as it might be called to a monarchy. And (2) it was in his capacity of prophet that Solomon consecrated the first temple. It is important to understand this; for it is demonstrably owing to a misconception of the Jewish history that the Anglican theology of the seventeenth century took the unfortunate Erastian colouring which has been so injurious to us.

One of the Thirty-nine Articles had previously spoken of "that prerogative which we see to have been given always to all godly princes in Holy Scripture by God Himself;" but a more exact criticism plainly shows that not only were David and Solomon truly prophets, but that the same character, if not quite so formally, belongs to Josiah and Hezekiah, as well as the Maccabees, who were also of priestly descent; and that it was in this capacity, and not as princes, that they did what is related of them.

The difference between ourselves and Dr. Wordsworth is not perhaps very great. Whatever prophets did, was done under the

promptings of a special revelation ; but while Dr. Wordsworth would regard all such acts as interruptions of God's settled laws, they take their places, according to the view here maintained, as illustrations of the fixed constitution of Israel, of which the prophetic order formed as legitimate an element as did the offices of Priest and King. So they need no apology.

But now to follow on our review of the prophetic function. The last representative of it undoubtedly was the Baptist: "The law and the prophets were until John." Or rather we might say that as Samuel in his own person had terminated one dispensation—that of judges, and commenced another—that of the order of prophets, so CHRIST was also a prophet of the expiring economy of Judaism, at the same time that He was the founder and Prophet of the new dispensation of the gospel.

But CHRIST, we know, was also the Priest of the new dispensation. To this office He was designated by the Voice of the FATHER and the descent of the HOLY GHOST, immediately after His Baptism (Heb. v. 5,) although, as S. Paul often tells us in the same Epistle, He did not truly enter on what is mystically its truest sense, until He entered into the heavens. A change was thus effected in the divine economy: the two offices which before had been kept distinct were now united in one: and further the Christian institutions were from the first pronounced, in distinct contrast with the temporary economy of Judaism—such as "cannot be moved." Consequently the sacred orders of the Christian Church are still to be regarded as having authority both to teach and to offer sacrifice, as of course they also as descendants of Him who was the lineal successor to David's throne, claim the "obedience"¹ of God's faithful people.

THE REVIEWER REVIEWED.

Recent Movements in the Church of England. An Article in Fraser's Magazine, September, 1866.

WE commend to our readers' perusal an article which has appeared in Fraser's Magazine, "Recent Movements in the Church of England." It is always well to know what an adversary can say against us, and the greater the ability of the attack the greater the test. Admitted into such a periodical, we may fairly conceive not only that the writer has done his best, but that few could do it better, and it is the more satisfactory therefore to find that he

¹ "Obey them that have the rule over you."—Heb. xiii. 17.

has no other charges to make against the Catholic movement than those which have been repeated, *ad nauseam*, in the columns of the *Record* and *Morning Advertiser*. It is usual in the Latin Church, before a saint is canonised, to give a fair hearing to the Devil's advocate, to let him say all he can against the proposed saint before the canonization is pronounced. In the same spirit we suggest that the author of "Recent Movements" should have a fair hearing, feeling assured that every unbiassed reader must rise from its perusal, with the conviction that it is only another instance of an attempt by a blind man to lead the way, and that both leader and followers must inevitably fall into that ditch of rationalism and infidelity which lies in the path of all those who are not led by the light of the Catholic faith.

The writer's attention appears to have been drawn to the "Essays on the Church and the World," (on which he bases his article,) by the book having been presented to Convocation by the Primate. This awkward fact he explains by the hypothesis, that "the Archbishop had probably never read the Essays carefully, but that they had been recommended to him by some one of consequence." Of course it is necessary for the writer to dispose of this little accident in some way, because when the Primate of the English Church accepts these Essays, as an "important contribution to ecclesiastical literature," it is as well to get over the trifling circumstance, before proceeding to denounce them as utterly opposed to the doctrines of that very same Church.

We find then, after a careful perusal of the article, that he has no newer charges to bring against us, than 1st, The folly of confession and its danger. 2ndly. The absurdity of supposing that ordination conveys supernatural, or, as he calls it, magical power. 3rdly. That the doctrine of the Real Presence is taught by the Clergy; or, as he irreverently describes it, that they pretend that they have the power to "create their own Creator."

Happily, so far as the first gravamen is concerned, if there be any one doctrine upon which there is no doubt whatever of the teaching of the Church of England, it is that of confession and absolution: the rubrics, more especially that in the service for the sick, and the absolution in that service, are so clear and distinct; and indeed were anything further needed to put all doubt out of the question, it would be supplied by the words used in the ordination of priests. These leave no room for doubt that the Church holds this doctrine clearly and distinctly; but any reference to them the writer judiciously excludes, and we have the old riddle about priests in families, the immense virtues of English families in general, and the disgust of "the adult male" in finding that his women and children go to confession. There is, however, no greater mistake than to imagine that the Catholic movement has taken a strong hold on women and children, to the exclusion of

its influence on men. On the contrary, nothing is more striking than the immense grasp it has gained on the affections of the young men of the rising generation.

It is impossible to enter any church where Catholic doctrine is taught in its integrity without seeing the large proportion of young men in the congregation. This was remarked by no less a person than the correspondent of the *Times* newspaper in speaking of St. Alban's. The reverence and devotion of their manner proves the deep sympathy they have in the service. Now it must be borne in mind that within ten years a large percentage of these young men will become fathers of families, heads of houses, uncles, masters, employers of labour, teachers; they will fill a thousand positions in which their influence will be felt. Who can tell the result of that influence, or the limit of its ramifications? Those leading members of the clergy who are renowned as spiritual directors could, we believe, state, without hesitation, that a large majority of those who resort to their ministrations are, in fact, "adult males."

But, of course, if confession and absolution go for nothing then Apostolical Succession must be abandoned also; for he says—

"Now we all know how bishops are really appointed. The Queen, or the prime minister, selects some one who is considered fit. A *congé d'élire* is sent to the dean and chapter of the cathedral over which he is to preside. The dean and chapter meet, invoke the HOLY SPIRIT to direct their choice, and elect the person whom the Crown has named. Three or more bishops then consecrate, and the work is done. In the whole business there is nothing real but the act of the Crown."

Nothing real! Of course not. The prayers to the HOLY SPIRIT are mere nonsense. The invocation to God Almighty is pure form, without one atom of reality. But if this be so, why perpetuate the farce? These are days in which we are getting rid of all forms as fast as we can. Why retain this? If there is nothing real but the act of the Crown, let our bishops be appointed in the same manner as the judges of the Queen's Bench. Such a course would get rid of the prevailing superstition; for we learn, "in the consecration as at present performed, there is supposed to reside a mystery, and it is pretended that the power bestowed by our LORD, when He breathed on the Apostles, is thus transmitted to their descendants;" and he continues, "We should therefore propose that for the future, when the Crown appoints, the chapter should be relieved."

Those who hold opinions such as the writer in *Fraser*, if they were honest, would leave the Church, and not endeavour to drive out others who accept its doctrines as they are taught by the Prayer Book. We all know the form prescribed by the Prayer Book for the admission of a priest. "Receive the HOLY GHOST for the office and work of a priest in the Church of God now com-

mitted unto thee by the imposition of our hands : Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven ; and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained."

The priest who accepts these words in their integrity, who teaches his flock their reality, is to be persecuted, according to this writer, until he leaves the Church, while the union really to be desired is—"A way should be opened for the Church of England to become again the Church of the nation ; and the Presbyterians and the Dissenters, no longer affronted with unrealities, would be willing, at no distant time, to accept a share in the advantages of the Establishment."

Of course let us have one Church for the man who believes in the Trinity and the man who denies the Trinity ; for the man who believes the inspiration of the Bible and the man who denies it—for him who believes in our LORD's Divinity and him who denies it—for those who believe the miracles and those who do not ; then of course we shall have one LORD, one faith, one baptism. Now every one can see the absurdity of such a proposition. You can have no union without a faith, that is, an accepted creed : you can have no creed without infallibility, and you can have no infallibility without a Church. Deny the validity of the supernatural powers conveyed by the laying on of hands, and you may just as well deny the Divinity of our LORD. Let those Protestants, if there be any, who still hold the leading doctrines of the Christian religion take this truth home to themselves, that Christianity divorced from Catholicism cannot exist. There is no end to the developements of private judgment, and he who begins by doubting the power of the Church will end by doubting the sacrifice of the Cross. This may not be so with the generation that is dying out, but it assuredly will be with the generation that is coming in. If we do not get hold of the rising generation and make them Catholics there is an end to the Christianity of this country.

But let us ask this writer, where is the line to be drawn ? Will you include Colenso in your proposed Church ? Will you include Jowett or any other of the Essayists and Reviewers ? What do you say to M. Renan ? How about the Unitarians ? Recollect these men are the representatives of different classes of dissent and Protestantism in this country and on the Continent. If you get rid of the Catholic party by "passing a knife through the stem of the parasite which is choking us" (what does this mean ?) in order to let in your new allies, we fear that your Church will be like the garment referred to by our LORD : the new piece will take away from the old and the rent be made worse. In fact, when you have cut off her sacraments and abolished her orders, would it not save trouble if you abolish the Church of England altogether ? As this writer professes to understand the doctrine of the English Church, it may be interesting to compare his views with no less an autho-

riety than Bishop Overall, who in commenting on the Absolution in the Liturgy, says—

“Confession of sins must necessarily be made to them, to whom the dispensation of the mysteries of God is committed. For so they which in former times repented among the saints, are read to have done. It is written in the gospel, that they confessed their sins to John the Baptist. In the Acts they all confessed their sins unto the Apostles, of whom they were baptized.”

And again; more emphatically in speaking of the Confession and Absolution in the Office for the Sick—

“The Church of England howsoever it holdeth not confession and absolution sacramental, that is made unto and received from a priest, to be so absolutely necessary, as that without it there can be no remission of sins; yet by this place it is manifest, what she teacheth concerning the virtue and force of this sacred action. The confession is commanded to be special, the absolution is the same that the ancient Church, and the present Church of Rome useth; what would they have more? . . . Our ‘if he feels his conscience troubled’ is no more than is ‘si inveniat peccata;’ for if he be not troubled with sin, what needs either confession or absolution? Venial sins that separate not from the grace of God, need not so much to trouble a man’s conscience. If he hath committed any mortal sin, then we require confession of it to a priest, who may give him, upon his true contrition and repentance, the benefit of absolution, which takes effect according to his disposition that is absolved. . . . The truth is, that in the priest’s absolution there is the true power and virtue of forgiveness, which will most certainly take effect, nisi ponitur obex, as in baptism.”

Another eminent divine, no less than Bishop Sparrow, in speaking on this subject makes the following observations:—

“This Absolution (the first) is an act of authority, by virtue of a ‘power and commandment of God to His ministers.’ And as we read S. John 20, ‘Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted.’ And if our confession be serious and hearty, this absolution is effectual, as if God did pronounce it from heaven. So sayes the Confession of Saxony and Bohemia; and so sayes S. Chrysost. in his fifth hom. upon Essay The same says S. Greg. hom. 26, upon the Gospels . . . S. Augustine and S. Cyprian, and generally antiquity sayes the same; so does our Church in many places, particularly in the form of Absolution for the sick; but above all, holy Scripture is clear, S. John 20, ‘Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them.’”

Throughout the whole of this article on “Recent Movements,” the writer shows the most lamentable ignorance of the history of the English Church since the Reformation, and he evidently confounds her with continental Protestant sects. There is the widest possible

distinction between the course pursued by the Church of England and the Lutheran and Calvinistic sects. In no respect is this distinction more remarkable than in the terms which they chose to designate their respective ministers. The Church of England combined in the movement of Reformation the whole Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, simultaneously joined in that movement. There was consequently no break in the Succession. But this was not the case with the Lutherans. No Bishop joined their movement, and consequently with the generation of Priests then alive the Succession died out. In order to avoid this dilemma Luther invented the plan of priests ordaining priests.

In Switzerland we have again another theory. There Calvin, the leader, was a layman only, and so the difficulty arose of how to preserve the Succession, not only without Bishops, but without Priests. He boldly threw over not merely the Bishops, but the priesthood also, and taught that Christian ministers were in fact merely Presbyters, pastors, and teachers. Here then we have the origin of Presbyterianism, not as a discovery of Scripture truth, but as an invention to bridge over the void created by the want both of Bishops and Priests among the Calvinists.

The great distinction between the English Church and those Protestant sects with which the author of "Recent Movements" would confound her is this, that we retained the sacramental system while the Calvinists abolished it, and the Lutherans betrayed it. That the Lutheran Church is dying out no candid observer will deny; the ultimate fate of Presbyterianism we have yet to learn, but it seems likely that its lapse into Rationalism will be as sure though slower than that of its Protestant sister.

The subject of the Real Presence is of course a serious charge with this writer against us, and he is quite incapable of perceiving the distinctions in that doctrine which are referred to by Mr. Medd; and he makes it a matter of regret that we are to cease to call ourselves Protestants; to abjure every Protestant doctrine as heretical, and more especially the Protestant doctrine of the Eucharist. What he means by "the Protestant doctrine" it is difficult to say, because every shade of doctrine has been held by Protestant sects at different times, from Transubstantiation to mere formalism. Again, he complains that after consecration the elements are to receive adoration. "Ordinary people," he says, "are not metaphysicians, and the distinction between worshipping a Being mysteriously present in a piece of bread, and worshipping that Being under the form of bread, is far too subtle for comprehension." Why so? Is there any difficulty in perceiving the difference between Moses worshipping the burning bush, and his worshipping God's especial presence? Further on we have the following irreverent sentence with regard to the consecration:

"The awful action!—for these people imagine nothing less than that in the words which he uses, the Priest conjures the Almighty Maker of the universe into the bread, and the most touching commemoration in the cycle of the Christian services is degraded into a mediæval hocus pocus."

An article like this is no place to vindicate the Real Presence, but we may fairly ask, as we are debating on the basis of the Church of England, for an explanation of those passages in the Catechism which clearly teach this doctrine; but of this there is not a word, and we are only referred to the Protestant meaning of the rite, which as one distinct doctrine does not exist.

We had always imagined that the Broad Church, or rational party, of which we presume this writer is a specimen, were to be commended at all events for their extreme toleration; that being numerically weak themselves, and wandering both from the spirit and letter of the Prayer Book, they were at least disposed to grant to others that latitude which they claim for themselves. But this appears not to be the case.

"The courts of law, we are told, have refused to meddle with Colenso, and have sanctioned the 'Essays and Reviews.' The fair play which has been extended to one extreme cannot be refused to the other. This is the language of the false mother before Solomon: Divide the child. Let truth be what any man troweth; let us all think as we please, and say what we please, and let the State pay us for our work. We shall have to ask then, What is the Church of England? Has it anything to teach, or has it nothing? Are the clergy to be allowed to go on indefinitely using the same formularies and accepting the same tests, yet demoralising themselves and their congregations by extracting meanings from them diametrically opposite? Neither liturgy nor articles will bear any further stretching, and if the strain be increased the system will assuredly crack. This also is an ominous symptom, that the clergy incline one way and the laity another. The secular courts tolerate the Liberals; Convocation smiles upon the Ritualists. The Bishops, it is plain, have been so frightened by the developments of Rationalism, that they have lost confidence in their ancient standing-ground. The old-fashioned, solid Protestantism is breaking down, as the Catholics boast that it is; and any quantity of superstition is now held more tolerable than too free a use of understanding."

We would indeed ask with this writer, What is the Church of England? has it anything to teach, or has it nothing? All that it has to teach which is distinct and tangible is Catholic; all that it has to teach that is obscure and indefinite is Protestant, and exhibits the old taint of heresy which in some phrases still lingers in the Book of Common Prayer.

The writer displays much ignorance in dealing with the question of what was the doctrine of the Church at the Reformation. Let

us see what were the views then current upon this "vexata questio" of the Real Presence. In 1539, when the Articles of the reformed Church were being settled by Convocation, Cromwell, the Vicar-general of King Henry VIII., submitted the following question to the Lower House:—"Whether there be, in the Sacrament of the Altar, Transubstantiation of the substance of the bread and wine into the substance of Flesh and Blood, or not? Whether, in the most Blessed Sacrament of the Altar, remaineth, after the consecration, the substance of bread and wine, or not?"

Their answer was as follows:

"That in the blessed Sacrament of the Altar, by the strength and efficacy of CHRIST's mighty word, it being spoken by a priest, is present really the natural Body and Blood of our SAVIOUR JESUS CHRIST, conceived by the Virgin Mary, under the form of bread and wine. And that after consecration there remaineth no other substance but the substance of His foresaid natural Body.'"

Now who is most loyal to this doctrine, the writers of "Essays on the Church and the World," or the writer of "Recent Movements?" who can most fairly be charged with disloyalty to the doctrines of the Reformed Church, as some please to term it? But not only does this writer deny the Catholic doctrine, but he is not even a respectable Protestant. He is worse than Luther, worse than the Germans and Swiss, for they one and all admitted a Presence more or less defined and substantial; but this writer, professing to state the Protestant doctrine, denies any Presence whatever.

It will occur to the minds of those who read this article that the writer has in all probability taken up the question of ritual on account of the interest which it is universally exciting, but without having the slightest practical or theoretical acquaintance with it, and his remarks show throughout a lamentable ignorance of what is going on now in the Church, of the history of the Reformation, and of the doctrines contained in the Prayer Book. "Old-fashioned, solid Protestantism is breaking down," he admits, and what we should seek for is a free use of the understanding. In ancient times, before there was such a thing as a measure, it was common to use the hand, and so many spans was the way in which broadcloth was sold to the customer. A span might and did differ with the size of the man's hand, one was large, another small, and consequently endless difficulties arose in making and concluding bargains. And is it not so with theology, if there be no measure, no accepted standard to which we can appeal, if every man is to measure it by the span of his own mind? If it be so, then farewell for ever to that unity which the Founder prescribed for His Church, and which was to be her characteristic to the end of time. One Faith?

why there must be as many faiths as minds, and even more, for with the "free use of understanding" a thinker must frequently change his views.

But after devoting so much space to the subject, our writer observes that "the intelligence of the nineteenth century is not to give way before a handful of effeminate fanatics, whether the Bishops approve or not." We pass over all the polite phraseology of this sentence; but it is only to protest against the idea that the Catholic party is now a handful of "ignorant fanatics." We number within our ranks the most learned and most devout men of the present day. Our numbers are to be counted, not by thousands or tens of thousands, but by hundreds of thousands. Take, for instance, the circulation of the *Church and the World*—one edition has been rapidly exhausted, and a second is called for, if it is not already published. Again, the *Directorium*, an expensive book, has been extensively sold, and upwards of a thousand copies have been issued; and in this instance, also, a second edition is on the point of being published. The Catholic party maintain six or seven newspapers, and the circulation of the one taking, perhaps, the highest Catholic views is to be numbered by thousands and thousands. Again, are not our churches springing up on every side? Look at the long list there is in London only. There are several lists of churches published by a leading bookseller, giving full accounts of these and their services. It may be true that vestments and incense have not yet been generally adopted, but assuredly they will be.

Nor are these changes introduced in defiance of the wishes of the congregations, but in deference to their wishes. In fact there is not a single instance of Catholic doctrines being taught where the effort has been a failure. If any one doubts this, let him go to these churches and see for himself. Let him go to S. Alban's, and see bench after bench of young men who, as the *Times* said, belong to a class more likely to be found in the casino. Here was applause wrung from an enemy; for certainly the *Times* is no friend to the ritualists. But it is the common remark of friend and foe, that, right or wrong in its tenets and practice, S. Alban's has laid a grasp on the rising generation which no other church has ever yet accomplished.

And not only have these churches their congregations, but there are numerous guilds and societies by which the young are enlisted in the Church's cause. Numerically, as compared with the Low Church and No Church parties, we may be weak; but there is a tremendous energy in the faith. Other reformations before this have been accomplished with much more slender means than those which are within our reach. We form a compact body, under excellent discipline, ready to attack heresy and crime in their strong-

holds. It is true that we do yield great respect to the clergy, but on the other hand we require from them lives of self-denial and work. Let us only for a moment compare the lazy life of we fear a large portion of the English clergy with the hard work of a catholic-minded priest. Take the former,—two services on Sunday and one sermon, perhaps a service on Thursday evening, a little district visiting among the respectable poor, and that is all. Then take the *daily* life of one of the curates of a Catholic church,—Seven o'clock, Holy Communion, or, as our writer terms it, Mass; eight o'clock, Matins; Wednesdays and Fridays, Litany at twelve o'clock; Saints' days, a second celebration of Holy Communion; Evensong at five or eight. These services with visiting, schools, societies, and a great deal more of those "private ministrations" than most Protestants imagine, take up the whole of his day. *Ora et labora* is the motto of his life. To vilify these men, to drive them out of the Church, is no doubt the self-appointed labour of many whose lives are far from blameless, but the earnest Catholic priest may comfort himself with the assurance that he is regarded by his flock with a reverence and affection to which no Protestant can pretend.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The North Side of the Table. By CHARLES JOHN ELLIOTT, M.A.—
Vicar of Winkfield, Berks. Windsor: Provert and Roberts. London: Parker and Co. 1866.

THIS pamphlet is an attempt to prove that north-side means north-end, and the still more impossible theory that "standing before the Table . . . he shall say the Prayer of Consecration," means that he is not to say it before the table, but at the north-end. We need hardly say that we do not consider Mr. Elliott to have proved his position. We make out the following facts as pretty clearly shown: that until Laud's time it was a very common thing to move the holy table for the celebration into the choir, or even into the nave, and that then it stood "table-wise," i.e., ends east and west. For instance, in the diocese of Bath and Wells there were, according to a letter written by the bishop, 469 churches; in only 140 was the holy table set "altar-wise." When Laud became Archbishop of Canterbury, he steadily set his face against this abuse, and, to a very great extent, remedied it. For not only was the altar set in its proper place, but also enclosed by rails; this last, probably, not only to keep it from possible profanation, but to render more difficult the removing of it into the chancel or nave. It also appears that, even when placed within the sacarium, many of the clergy used to set it "table-wise," east and west; themselves, of course, standing at the north-side. One of the articles of impeachment

against Bishop Wren—strangely enough, given by Mr. Elliott—after saying that he set up the communion-table “close under the wall at the east end of the chancel, altar-wise, and not to be removed thence,” adds, “whereby the minister, who is by the law to officiate at the north-side of the table, must either stand and officiate at the north-end of the table, so standing altar-wise; or else, after the Popish and idolatrous manner, stand and officiate at the west-side of the table with his back towards the people.” Here we see not only a proper distinction between north-side and north-end, but also that standing at the north-end was considered an unwarrantable innovation. When the holy table was set altar-wise, it was very well understood that the celebrant would follow the table, and stand at the side, and not at the end. This was what Laud intended, as well as what he practised himself.

At the Restoration, the puritan custom of moving the holy table almost universally ceased; it from thenceforth stood altar-wise, was called the altar, and was railed in; in other words, the counter-reformation begun by Laud, and to establish which, we may fairly say, he suffered martyrdom, was universally sanctioned by the Church. With the change of position of the altar came the change of position of the celebrant *as regarded the people*, but not as regarded the altar; he still stood at the *side*, not at the *end*. This, we say, was the intention of the Church; but, probably from long custom, or from a fear to give offence to the people, the celebrant did not like to turn his back on the congregation, and so compromised the matter by standing at the north-end. Mr. Elliott, and those who think with him, wilfully shut their eyes to this fact: they abuse Laud, talk of his “innovations,” and condemn them; stultifying themselves thereby, for all these “innovations” were made the law and custom of the divines of the Restoration, and are so still.

But, after all, supposing the position of the celebrant to be doubtful, the Church herself has given us the rule to be followed in all doubtful matters, an appeal, not, as Mr. Elliott and others like him would maintain, to the puritan practice of the seventeenth century, but to the practice of the Western Church in all ages. In the thirtieth canon we are instructed as follows:—“Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, Germany, or any such like Churches, in all things which they held and practised, that as the Apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain those ceremonies which do neither endanger the Church of God nor offend the minds of sober men, and only departed from them in those particular points wherein they were fallen, both from themselves in their ancient integrity, and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders.”

It would be well if these weighty words were more frequently quoted; for they tell us pretty plainly what is the *true mind of the Church*. The Homilies speak the same language, saying, “Let this Sacrament be in such wise done and ministered, as the good Fathers in the primitive Church frequented It.”

It is pleasant to see the Dean of WESTMINSTER applying his historical enthusiasm for the purpose of kindling the zeal of Londoners at once for the restoration of the ancient religious edifices and for the erection of new ones in parts of the metropolis which are really not much more than Christian in name. In his sermon preached at Westminster Abbey "at the first Annual Service for the Bishop of London's Fund," (Parker) he applies figuratively the verse which the old Crusaders prayed over literally, "Build Thou the walls of Jerusalem." It is a noble enterprise, and it seems to be quite Dr. Stanley's vocation to break down the prejudice of an effete Evangelicalism which was dominant among the London clergy, without any spark of zeal or piety, but yet had strength enough to check the growth of any better faith, or more self-denying practice. It is true wisdom to say, "Let one win souls by his ritual, another by his schools, another by his preaching, another by his clubs or his lectures," &c. Catholics only want fair play.

Chancellor MASSINGBERD has published a new and enlarged edition of his *History of the Reformation*, (Longmans) which originally appeared in the "Englishman's Library." The author is entitled to the credit of having written a genuine and original work in a true Church spirit. At the same time we need something more comprehensive, and which is better calculated to meet the inquiries which are constantly made at the present day in reference to the ground occupied by the Church of England.

Selections, New and Old, (Masters, London,) does not sound a very attractive title; but the Preface, by the Bishop of OXFORD, will induce many persons to purchase it, and those who do will find much in it to instruct and interest.

We cordially recommend *Heads for Harvest Festivals*, by the Rev. J. BAINES, (Parker, London,) which contains both sermons and heads of sermons, besides other useful matter.

Dr. HESSEY, the Incumbent of S. Barnabas, Kensington, has published two volumes of *Catechisings*. (Parker.) The first volume contains expositions of our LORD's Parables, and so does not touch very much upon doctrines. But in the second volume the theological defect of the writer comes out very strongly to view, and as an exponent of the Catechism and Prayer Book, we are compelled to say that Dr. Hessey is entirely untrustworthy. To catechise on the Thirty-nine Articles, as though they were a standard of doctrine, seems to us altogether a mistake.

Mr. PARKER has published an abridgment of his popular *Glossary of Architecture*, which will be found acceptable to many. We should, nevertheless, have recommended so far enlarging the scope of it, as to introduce a few cognate terms which belong to ecclesiology rather than, strictly speaking, to architecture. There used to be once a very handy manual of the kind we mention published by the Ecclesiological Society, which we fancy has been for some time out of print.

DANIEL EXAMINED.

Messiah the Prince, or the Inspiration of the Prophecies of Daniel. Containing Remarks on the Views of Dr. Pusey, Mr. Desprez, and Dr. Williams, concerning the Book of Daniel. Together with a Treatise on the Sabbatical Years and Jubilees. By J. W. BOSANQUET, F.R.S.A. London: Longman. 8vo., pp. 336.

THIS is decidedly an able book, as far as 'chronology is concerned, for its writer has made himself thoroughly master of the historical portion of the subject of which he is writing; and as being the last contribution to our literature upon this prophet, embodying the results of all the previous labourers in the same field, it will hold its rank for some time to come as a valuable work for reference, in connection with profane history. Mr. Bosanquet seems to be an able ancient historian, a very fair chronologist, but a most indifferent, or rather, we ought to say, heretical theologian. From his book we must judge him to belong to the extreme section of the so-called "Evangelical" party. He is an unflinching advocate for the literal restoration of the Jews. He identifies, in most unevangelical language, the "little horn" with the Roman Pontiff. He laughs to scorn the pious horror which filled so many truly holy souls at the committal of the English Church to such an unwonted anomaly as the Jerusalem bishopric. He praises the late Dr. Arnold, and, on his authority, gives up to the Rationalists certain portions of Daniel's inspired prophecy. On the first head we read, the Jews are the "saints of the Most High," the "holy people," (pp. 13, 14.) "Of the sons of Abraham, therefore, in their exile and dispersion, does the prophecy of Daniel speak, when he foretells the oppression of the 'saints' for a period of 1260 years." "When Daniel speaks of the future glory of the children of Israel, as 'saints' in the kingdom of the Son of Man, and of the accomplishment and termination of the dispersion of the 'holy people,' he clearly refers to those then far-distant times, when the chosen people of God shall again recognize their God; God shall again 'take pleasure in His people.'" "Thus then it appears that there has been lying open before us, for more than two thousand years, a page of the Sacred Volume, professing to contain a distinct revelation from the Most High of the history of His elect people, the seed of Abraham, even down to the time when they shall again possess the kingdom." "Such was the interpretation set by Daniel upon the words, 'saints of the Most High,' such has ever been the interpretation of Jewish commentators, looking for the restoration of Israel in the kingdom of the Messiah; and such should be the interpretation of every Christian, who believes that the 'Son of

VOL. XXVIII.—NOVEMBER, 1866. 3 u

Man,' 'the Anointed Prince,' 'the Righteous Branch unto David,' came into the world, though rejected of His own, to be 'a light to lighten the Gentiles,' and 'therefore' . . . 'to be the glory of His people Israel.'"

Dr. Pusey, in opposition to this "letter which killeth," upholds with the whole body of Catholic tradition, the fulfilment of Daniel's prophecy by the *spiritual* Israel of God, believing, with S. Paul, that there is no longer any distinction between Jew and Gentile; that the middle wall of partition has been for ever broken down; that all are the children of Abraham who are partakers of Abraham's faith; that he is not a Jew who is one outwardly; and that the true circumcision is of the spirit and not of the letter. Mr. Bosanquet, who on this as on many other points, has yet to learn the meaning of S. Paul's Epistles, and who seems to be most imperfectly instructed in the *στοιχεῖα* of the faith, finds fault with Dr. Pusey for teaching S. Paul's doctrine:

"The future destinies and glory of God's elect, but cast-off people, which we cannot but feel form the chief subjects of Daniel's predictions, do not seem to come even within the range of his contemplation; while in his tenderness towards Rome, so far from looking upon the Papal power as the oppressor of the 'holy people,' he seems to hint at the present persecution of the see of Rome itself as the fulfilment of the prophecy."

A man who can so calmly Judaize an important book of inspired prophecy, is unworthy of the slightest confidence as a theologian. In the second place, as to the "little horn."

"How prominently does the 'little horn,' 'speaking very great things,' stand out in history. Our eyes are directed to the seven hills of Rome. We are confined to a selection thence of one of the ten fragments, into which the last, or Roman empire has long since been broken. And we are compelled to look among them for a little but oppressive power, diverse from all which had preceded him, and 'speaking very great things,' who ought now to have existed, seated on those seven hills, for the period of some 1260 years." "The temporal power of the Papacy seems to be vanishing before our eyes, if indeed it has not already ceased to exist; but how long the spiritual power shall be allowed to linger on in the ancient seat of its dominion, is a question to be solved by time." "The nature of his blasphemy hitherto is, not that he has rejected God, but that he has made his word equal to that of God; and yet, perhaps, deeper and more distinct blasphemy may in the nature of things be expected from him as the time of his destruction approaches."

Can narrow-minded offensive bigotry go beyond such language as this? Hardly; yet, perhaps, the following long quotation, though more virulent, is scarcely less bitter. It seems at first to

include the whole of the Gentile Church, and to narrow its scope as it proceeds.

“ What is the history of the outward Church of GOD from the beginning, from which nevertheless a cloud of holy saints has been gathered, and is gathering, even till this day? Is it not a history of idolatry, rebellion, perversion of the Word of GOD, yet not of persecution as regards the Jewish Church: of heresy, schism, idolatry, superstition, persecution, blood-guiltiness, and at length of pride and arrogance, reaching even to heaven, on the part of its Gentile successor? In the Gentile Church there sits exalted the self-styled Vicar of CHRIST. Beside him, robed in scarlet, sit the so-called successors of the holy Apostles. The kings of the earth are but as dust beneath their feet. The powers that be, with them are not ordained of GOD. The very minor offshoots of this towering Church rejoice in the appellation of ‘High.’ All that is opposed to them is stigmatised as ‘Low.’ They cast away with scorn the Tables of Commandments given from Mount Sinai, and set up in their stead their own most strange devices. The ‘Table of the LORD’ entrusted to their care, has become the table of the money-changers. The beautiful doctrine of the ‘bread which came down from heaven’—the spiritual sustenance of fainting souls—is degraded into worship of material bread. Professing the doctrine of one only GOD, as taught by the LORD Himself in His own perfect form of prayer, ‘OUR FATHER which art in heaven;’ their teaching is of three co-equal, co-eternal GODS. And —”

But we will not further nauseate our readers by continuing this blasphemous tirade; this Judaizing Arianism must have filled them with loathing, and turned them away from the quotation. Nor will we cite any more of Mr. Bosanquet’s slanderous and unchristian language concerning the Roman Pontiff, to whom the *primacy* in the Apostolic college has been given from our Blessed LORD’s own days until now.

The Jerusalem bishop figures conspicuously in his book :

“ We have seen such men as Dr. Newman, influenced by the same admiration of the Church of Rome, and deep contempt for the scarcely more erring Jewish Church, actually driven from communion with the Church of England, as he tells us, by the idea of a Protestant bishop—a bishop of the circumcision, one who boasted of his Jewish descent—being placed at Jerusalem. This was ‘the blow that finally shattered the faith in the Anglican Church’ of this most frail of religious barks, as if the tendency of the movement were not in accordance with the ways of GOD, and not, indeed, a first step, at least, though a remote one, towards the restoration of His holy people to their own land in communion with the Church of CHRIST.”—P. 24.

It is complained that Dr. Manning “scarcely recognises the operation of the HOLY SPIRIT in the Jewish Church of old, much less the future operation of the HOLY SPIRIT on His people yet to

come." Dr. Newman is brought forward again (p. 215) as one who "takes refuge in horror in the Church of Rome, lest he should be contaminated even with the idea of a Protestant Bishop of Jerusalem." Of Catholics Mr. Bosanquet observes that "they believe in the temporal mission of the HOLY SPIRIT, but not in the future temporal mission of the Son of Man." "They realise the personal Advent of the Son of Man in humility, but it is inconceivable to them that at His Second Advent He shall come unto His own again in glory." Let our readers especially weigh the meaning of the expression, "the scarcely more erring Jewish;" then will they be able to appreciate the length to which a virulent and blind fanaticism carries its unhappy votaries. A Christian Church, because it has departed somewhat from the simplicity of the Gospel, is placed in the same category, only a little higher in the scale, with a Church which was but as a shadow or an adumbration of better things to come, and which ended its fallen and worn out career by crucifying the very LORD of Glory Himself. Because, in some respects, the Roman Church has materialised our Blessed LORD's Humanity, she is to be classed with those who altogether scorned Him; who rejected Him as Man and God; who, as being His murderers, called down upon their own heads His blood in fearful imprecations. If this were merely a secular question, we should charge Mr. Bosanquet with unfairness and dishonesty in classing together a Christian and the Jewish Church. As it is, we charge him with uttering the vilest and most revolting falsehoods. Then, again, it is untrue to say that the Church Catholic does not believe in "the future temporal mission of the Son of Man." She does believe in it most unhesitatingly and most firmly. She both holds and teaches that at the last day our Blessed LORD shall meet here on earth all His elect; the Jew with the Gentile—Abel and Abraham, and David, with S. John Baptist, the Holy Innocents, and all the vast company of martyred and of virgin souls who will have their blessed portion in "the first resurrection."

With Mr. Bosanquet's denial "of three co-equal, co-eternal Gods," we find, as we should naturally expect to find, united, but small reverence for the *text* of the Book of Daniel, of which he scruples not to reject certain passages as spurious interpolations.

"The principal interpolation lies between chapter x. 14, and chapter xi. 35, exclusive of a genuine passage, xi. 2, 3, 4, and professes to be an explanation of 'that which is noted in the Scripture of truth,' that is to say, noted in the book or writing then lying before the interpreter, concerning 'the truth,' a comment founded upon which must not be mistaken for prophecy. We think that the marks of paraphrase may clearly be discovered both at the beginning, middle, and end of the passage. . . . We venture to submit that the portion of Daniel which has given so much offence to seriously-minded critics, and which bears

about it the appearance of so comparatively low and human a style of composition, is, in fact, merely one of these many forced attempts at application of prophecy to the days of the Maccabees. We agree with Arnold that 'there can be no spiritual meaning made out of the kings of the north and south,' and the passages therefore containing those histories cannot be reckoned as the words of Daniel. They are obviously made up of pure history, and though written, indeed, in the form of prophecy, as was the style and manner of the day, with a view probably to increased dignity; yet in their original form, as we shall endeavour to show, they had no pretension to be considered words of prophecy at all. We believe them to represent merely an ingenious instance of an illustrative paraphrase, written by the hand of some zealous Pharisee (the contest of angels in chapter x. is clearly Pharisaic) of Jerusalem soon after the days of Antiochus, and that they were inserted marginally with the intention of concentrating on Antiochus and his days prophecies which were never intended to apply to him, but which, by means of this one interpolation, are clearly made so to bear."

In thus unlawfully tampering with the sacred deposit of the inspired Canon, Dr. Arnold's name comes into frequent mention in connection with this one "doubtful chapter." "The words of Dr. Arnold have come back upon us so forcibly, and he seemed to suggest the means of so efficient an explanation." And this is the statement of the Rugby schoolmaster and Rationalist, that meets with Mr. Bosanquet's approval—

"I have long thought that (the greater ?) part of Daniel is most certainly a very late work of the times of the Maccabees, and the pretended prophecy about the kings of Greece and Persia, and the north and the south, mere history. In fact, you can trace distinctly the date when it was written, because the events up to that date are given with historical minuteness totally unlike the character of real prophecy."—*Life*, vol. ii. p. 75.

The "pretended prophecy" of Dr. Arnold was but the forerunner of the "no pretensions to be considered words of prophecy at all," which we find written by Mr. Bosanquet. Again, "Arnold, we think, has done service to the cause of truth in boldly speaking out, and thus leading to inquiry." As a sort of sop to Cerberus, Mr. Bosanquet would give up that portion of the eleventh chapter which he seems to think applies unmistakably and directly to Antiochus Epiphanes. "The hero of the supposed prophetic poem, on removal of a portion of chapter xi. entirely disappears; each chapter of the book which has been forced into connection with his history, then remains to be explained in the spirit of its own plain contents." Pages of long and elaborate argument are spent in accounting for, first, the construction of the synagogue rolls, even, and then to the pointing out the reasons which induce these unauthorised mutilators of Holy Scripture to rid themselves of their fanciful interpolation. An elaborate examination and

argument occurs under each of the following nine heads :—“ The questionable passages disturb the continuity of the prophecy.” “ They destroy the consistency of the prophecy.” They “ were not treated by Jews as prophecy before the birth of CHRIST ; ” “ they destroy the perspicuity, unity and sublimity of the book of Daniel, and contract the scope of the several prophecies contained in it.” That “ except upon the principle of text and running comment,” it is difficult to account for the repetition “ of the same phrases in the same order of continuity ; ” “ that they disturb the reckoning of the chronology of the whole Bible ; ” that “ the wilful King of xi. 36—45, is apparently identified with Antiochus the Great in xi. 16—19, which is necessarily a false interpretation, and the last of these passages, therefore, is not the writing of Daniel ; ” lastly, if the *fourth* empire is the Roman, divided into ten parts, then chapter xi. falsely “ identifies these ten horns with ten Syrian and Egyptian kings who reigned after Alexander.” The whole of these seeming difficulties are capable of a most complete solution without demanding the sacrifice of any portion of the text or attempting to pass a portion of the prophecy itself off under the form of a comment. Let our readers carefully study Dr. Pusey’s *fifth* lecture on “ Daniel the Prophet,” and they will be able to form a just opinion as to the true value of these nine arguments brought forward by Mr. Bosanquet. It is there shown, by numerous examples, how full the Old Testament is of “ definite prophecies ; ” that “ definite prediction, prediction as definite as those in the Book of Daniel, is an essential part of its system. Porphyry’s German followers accepted this issue. They rejected the definite predictions of Daniel, but only in common with all other definite predictions in the Old and New Testament.” “ So far from these minute temporal prophecies, such as we have in Daniel, being alien from Old Testament prophecy, they are, in fact, a part of God’s whole way of acting under the Old Dispensation.” Bearing directly on this very question of the eleventh chapter being a direct history of Antiochus, is the latter portion of Dr. Pusey’s second lecture (pp. 90—99,) where it is proved that Antiochus Epiphanes does *not* correspond to the Antichrist of either the seventh or eleventh chapter, and where the direct contrast in their characters is pointed out ; as well as the failure of the rationalists in seizing upon the special character of Antichrist. But even if Antiochus Epiphanes were spoken of in chapter xi., there would be no need to give up such descriptions as an interpolation. “ It would prove nothing,” says Dr. Pusey ; “ it would only be that same foreshortening which we find throughout Holy Scripture, and in our LORD’s own prediction, first, of the destruction of Jerusalem, and then of His second coming to judge the world.” Of the six marks of Antichrist, only one applies to Antiochus, viz. blasphemy against the true God. “ Blasphemy against God is an

essential feature of any God-opposed power or individual. It belongs to Voltaire as much as to Antiochus." In the eighth chapter of Daniel, where Daniel "did portray Antiochus, every trait corresponds, we are at a loss for nothing, not a word is without meaning. What, then, is the inference as to this description, of which only one line is in common with Antiochus, and that *one* line belonging to every sort of blasphemer? What can be the inference, but that Antiochus is not intended? If you have two portraits by one hand, the one resembling its original, the other wholly unlike, you doubt not that it represents some other man." We need not, therefore, under the pressure of any supposed historical necessity, allow of Mr. Bosanquet's "interpolations." While we cling to the Athanasian faith, we hold fast the text of the Word of God; we should not dare to Judaize, with the New Testament in our hands and realising our glorious calling as a part of the New Creation. We would deliver over Mr. Bosanquet to the full enjoyment of those crude sophistries of textual criticism, the firstfruits of which seem to be so pleasant to his taste, without another word on the subject; but the following proposition is so novel and racy, it is so transcendently Judaic, that we cannot refrain from giving it in his own words. We fear, too, that no one would believe us if we told them that any man said it who professed to be a Christian, even were he but an Arian or holder of the lowest and most degraded form of the doctrines of the Cross.

"Yet if it is true, as we trust that we have succeeded in showing, that the text of the book is corrupt, and has been tampered with by unskilful hands, then it is clear, not only that it is not profane, but, on the contrary, that it is the bounden duty of all who possess the power, to question, scrutinise, and dissect each chapter and sentence of the book, with the view, if possible, of restoring the integrity of the inspired text. We have less reason to be unthankful than to be ashamed, at having thus been forced unwillingly to recognise corruption in this sacred writing by the bold and sometimes impious remarks of sceptical inquirers. But having at length thus stumbled on the truth, we trust investigation will be carried henceforth fearlessly to the full extent; not, indeed, by the rude hands of those who love dissection merely for dissection's sake, nor by the hands of those 'blind leaders of the blind who neither enter in themselves, nor suffer those who would to enter in,' to perform the sacred task. We submit that in this one instance, at least, the '*quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus*,' of the schoolmen—that axiom by which every ancient error might be perpetuated, may be laid aside; that the book should be submitted for revision to the careful hands of those to whom the oracles of God were formerly entrusted, should undergo the scrutiny of God's own holy people, who in these days of enlightenment, with their knowledge of the language, and of Hebrew modes of comment, may yet be able to throw light upon the way in which, and the extent to which, corruption has set in."

In other words, Mr. Bosanquet, by *supposing* series of interpolations, "having at length *stumbled* upon the truth;" the Book of Daniel may be cut up *ad infinitum* upon his own theory; but as he ignorantly supposes that Jews are better Hebraists than Christians, as well as on account of their ancient position, he would leave the Catholic Church to accept this book of Holy Scripture to be dealt with by them as they list, and then to be received by her at their hands. Rationalism, open, undisguised, and daring, is a very painful spectacle to any earnest-minded member of the Catholic Church; but when it comes before us, as it does in "Messiah the Prince," mingled with equal proportions of Arianism and Judaism, it forms such a nauseous dose that if any one should swallow it unawares, we can make to him the same promise that Æschylus tells us Apollo made to the Chorus, whose cause was not then ended, and tell him, for his comfort, that upon due reflection ἐμὲ τὸν λόγ, and so he will be relieved of its ill effect.

We sincerely regret that Mr. Bosanquet did not confine himself to strictly chronological questions, for in such matters he is at home, and his ability finds a legitimate field for its exercise. We think that he has proved his great historical point "that Daniel's master was no other than the great Persian King Darius, son of Hystaspes, one of the best known kings of Persian history,"—thus far having done a real service towards unfolding the dates of Daniel. Undoubtedly, too, the "after threescore and two weeks," and the cutting off the Messiah, &c., must necessarily be excluded from the series of events comprehended within the seventy weeks." There is some truth in the statement that Dr. Pusey, who had "the key to unlock the mystery, casts it away by surrendering himself into the hands of Prideaux." But good chronology can be no set-off against bad theology, and it is on this latter ground that we are obliged so strongly to condemn Mr. Bosanquet's book on Daniel.

WALTON ON THE CELEBRANT'S POSITION.

The Rubrical Determination of the Celebrant's position, considered in a Letter to the Rev. T. T. Carter, M.A., Rector of Clewer.

By HENRY BASKERVILLE WALTON, M.A., Late Fellow of Merton College. London and Oxford: Rivingtons. 1866.

WE lately noticed a pretentious pamphlet on this subject by Mr. Elliott, whose aim is to show that the north end of the Altar is the proper place for the Celebrant to stand, even at Consecration. The present letter is a complete refutation of the arguments of the

former. The question, of course, turns on the meaning of "north side" in our present rubric. Mr. Walton very clearly shows that the introduction of this term in 1552 took place simultaneously with the substitution of tables, set east and west, for the ancient altars:—

"The Rubric of 1549, directing the Priest to stand 'humbly afore the midst of the Altar,' points to the time when the ancient consecrated altars remained 'as in times past,' erected against the east wall of the chancels; it belongs to that period referred to in our Prayer Book as 'the second year of the reign of King Edward the Sixth.' But with the Rubric of 1552 a wholly different state of things had come in. The sinister influences of Foreign Reformers had told upon the Ritual of the English Church; not only had the ancient altars been violently pulled down from the east end of the churches, but the tables substituted for them, in order to contrast, as much as possible, with the form and appearance of an altar, were now placed lengthwise down the chancel, or in the body of the church, i.e., the nave, the two ends of the table being set east and west."—P. 3.

This change, causing considerable confusion from the Celebrant not knowing where to stand, necessitated a wording of the new Prayer Book, to determine his position: consequently he is then directed to stand on the north side, i.e., in the middle of the long side, facing south. The authorities in Edward the Sixth's time intended to substitute tables, thus placed for altars, throughout the whole country, and accordingly framed this Rubric to meet the change. The fact however is, that in the Chapels Royal, and in some of the cathedrals, the ancient altars still remained, or tables, set altarwise, preserved the pattern and witness of ancient usage, and with this the augury of better things in time to come.

"So that the uninterrupted retention of the Holy Table in its accustomed position in certain chapels and cathedrals was analogous to the exclusive preservation of the Choral Service down to our time in such places, serving thus to perpetuate the type of ancient Ritual, and to exhibit a pattern to which, in due time, Parish Churches might gradually conform themselves."—P. 5.

After citing evidence from Heylin and other writers of that period, sufficient to establish his position, Mr. Walton goes on to show, from the same source, that the standing at the north end was considered to be wholly inadmissible under the Rubric, and was in itself a strange and unwarrantable usage: Bishop Williams, in the celebrated Grantham case, writing to the vicar, urges that if the table be set altarwise the Rubric cannot be complied with:—

"If you mean by altarwise, that the table should stand close along by the wall, so as you be forced to officiate at one end thereof, (as you may have observed in great men's chapels,) I do not believe that ever

the Communion Tables were (otherwise than by casualty) *so placed in country churches*. . . . The Minister appointed to read the Communion is directed to read the Commandments, not at the *end*, but at the north *side* of the table, which implies the *end* to be placed towards the east great window.'—Pp. 70, 71.

And again—

"This table must not stand altarwise, and you at the north *end* thereof, but tablewise, as you must officiate at the north *side* of the same.'

"Precisely in the same way Peter Smart, in 1628, shows that the words of the Rubric are incompatible with the altarwise position: 'Our Communion Table must stand as it had been wont to do in the midst of the quire; not at the east end, as far as is possible from the people. . . . Neither must the table be placed along from north to south, as the altar is set, but from east to west, as the custom is of all Reformed Churches; otherwise the Minister cannot stand *at the north side, there being neither side toward the north*. And I trow there are but two sides of a long table, and two ends: make it square, and then it will have four sides, and no end; or four ends and no side, at which any Minister can stand to celebrate.'—P. 11.

Heylin seems to be the first, at least he is the foremost advocate for the north end: he wished to see all tables set altarwise, and then tried to accommodate an incongruous Rubric to such a position. Williams, however, would not let him off so easily, but insisted that end and side were two different things; and that, to comply with the Rubric, the tables must stand east and west. No one will doubt that Laud intended the Celebrant to stand in the midst of the altar, on the west side, when he caused the tables to be set in their ancient place; and we can have as little doubt that he did so in order to restore the doctrine of the Eucharistic sacrifice. He admits the fact himself, though in his trial he is content to assign a lower motive, one which his enemies could not gainsay, that there is greater convenience for the manual actions.

In a note, Mr. Walton examines Archdeacon Freeman's interpretation of "north side," taken from an Eastern Liturgy; he pronounces against it, on the ground that these Liturgies were unknown to the Bishops in 1552, and that, had they known them, they were not likely to borrow from them, being at that time under the influence of foreign Protestants.

With regard to the Coronation Office, he says, that for its alteration from time to time by the Archbishop of Canterbury, and from the term "north side" being a late introduction, it cannot be considered as anything but an accommodation to existing usages, or rather existing language:—

"As regards the use of 'north side,' this term cannot here possibly mean more or less than what it means historically in the Prayer Book

from which it is taken ; but with every effort on my part I have quite failed to discern the inference claimed for its occurrence in certain of the Coronation Rubrics."—P. 59.

It has, however, this value, and it is no small one, that it is impossible to comply with the north end usage in great functions, and that, by enlarging the term so as to include the whole of the northern space of the sacrarium, it renders it impossible to limit the term to one very small portion of it, the north end.

Mr. Walton makes the following very just observations :—

"And here I would interpose a remark of a somewhat general kind. The subject I am discussing illustrates what appears to be a law observable throughout certain controversies of the Church, that the vantage ground, or contested outpost, which has been thankfully gained in a preceding generation by one party, is occupied in the next by their opponents, who, by an inconsistency, common to either side, are content to maintain, though on different principles, the very position abandoned by the others. In the present case, it was not the Puritan or Low Church party of the 17th century who [which] contended for consecrating at the north end of the table, but the more advanced High Churchmen, whose controversial position gave them a temporary interest in advocating such a usage ; and it would be well in the present day to remember which theological party it was who [which] strenuously opposed and repudiated officiating at the north *end* as an innovation unauthorised by the letter of the Rubric."—P. 15.

A fact somewhat similar to this may be observed within this last five and twenty years. In 1842 the High Churchmen took their stand on the Rubric, and nothing but the Rubric, e.g., for the sole use of the surplice and the prayer for the Church Militant, against the lax practices of the Low party ; now, when the High Churchmen of 1866 are insisting on the Eucharistic vestments and the Celebrant's position in the midst of the altar, it is the Low party which cries out for the surplice and the north end as *alone rubrical* !

Mr. Walton proceeds to compare the Liturgies of 1549, 1552, 1637 (Scotch,) with the revised one of 1661 ; consulting Sancroft's and Cosin's MSS. In doing this he says : "It is remarkable that we can actually trace the mental process of composition, the gradual formation and putting together of these much disputed words." For the tracing of this process we must refer our readers to the Letter itself. What he shows is this : that the compilers of the Liturgy of 1637 took that of 1549 for their model ; and that those of 1661 laboured to bring the English Liturgy into conformity with the Scotch, occasionally going back to the original model of 1549, e.g., in the Rubric on ornaments.

The following is the order of events and changes, as laid down by the writer : In the Liturgy of 1549, altars were still standing,

and the Celebrant occupied the ancient place "in the midst of the altar." In 1552 altars were removed, or ordered to be removed, and tables substituted, which were to stand east and west: then came the Rubric to meet the altered state of things, and the Celebrant was to stand at the "north side." Laud endeavoured to restore the ancient usage of altars by setting the Holy Table altarwise, thus bringing back the Celebrant to his old position. This was strenuously opposed by the Puritans: so High Churchmen, led by Heylin, advocated a compromise, and invented the north end practice. At the Restoration, altars were generally replaced in their proper position, but the High Church tradition of north end, considerably aided by the Rubric in the Scottish Liturgy, prevailed, and the "standing before the Holy Table," even when plainly ordered, was not practised. Then arose certain commentators on the Prayer Book, Wheatley, Nichols, and others, who explained away the Rubric to suit universal custom.

Our present position, then, is this: The Revision of 1661, referring to the Book of 1549 in the Rubric on ornaments, together with the general order that followed that revision, viz. of restoring the Holy Table to the place and position of the altar, has, by implication, abrogated the north side Rubric, or, at least, rendered obedience to it impossible: as long as the Holy Table stands in the place of the ancient altar, it is impossible to stand on the north side, seeing there is now no north side to stand at. The Celebrant must then necessarily resume his place in the "midst of the altar," as ordered by the Rubric of 1549. The modern practice of some Ritualists to stand at the northern part of the west side, save at the commencement¹ of the office, is wholly untenable, and contrary to all Catholic usage. The Rubric on Ornaments of 1661, referring us back to the Book of 1549, overrides the Rubrics of 1552 in the matter of the Celebrant's position, in like manner as it overrides that which enjoined the use of the surplice only in the celebration, and sanctions the proper Eucharistic vestments.

Let our readers weigh Mr. Walton's concluding words:—

"Wherever the architectural and ecclesiological fixtures of a chancel, under the process of restoration or otherwise, have assumed that arrangement and appearance spoken of in our Rubric as prevailing 'in times past,' i.e., with a correctly proportioned altar, standing in its ancient position, and duly vested, it really does appear altogether a ritual anachronism, with such a revival, for the Priest to stand elsewhere than in the position enjoined by our first Liturgy, and sanctioned by our present Rubric. On mere grounds of 'convenience,' the north end, if we have the ancient type of altar, becomes altogether incompatible with 'readiness and decency.' It moreover places the Priest in a position at the altar altogether unique and unheard of in the ritual of

¹ I.e., up to the Creed.

any Church throughout the world, whether Catholic or Reformed; a position, as regards the altar itself, not contemplated by the Revisers of 1552, and as regards the Priest, not required by those of 1661."—P. 43.

Again :

"If there be any force in these considerations, it is absolutely certain that an increasing number of clergy will ask themselves whether it is worth while, in the ceremonial of our highest act of worship, to be guided by the obsolete language of Swiss Puritans, for a time dominant in our Rubric, instead of loyally following the unrepealed and inextinguishable rule of Catholic Ritual, embodied in our first Liturgy; and whether it is not better to conform our present practice to the usages of that ancient Church to which our latest Revisers so deferentially appealed, than to perpetuate the mistaken practice of certain High Church Caroline Divines, who, we may fairly say, invented the custom of standing at the north *end*, in defiance both of the reclamation of the Puritans, and the original intention of the Rubric."—P. 44.

There is one point that the writer seems to us to have omitted to examine: we mean a statement made by Wheatley (ap. vi. § 4.) "And Bishop Beveridge has shown that wherever, in the ancient Liturgies, the Minister is directed to stand *before* the altar, the north side is always meant." In the margin are given these references: "Bev. Pandect. vol. ii. p. 76, § 15. See also Renaudotius's Liturgies, tom. ii. p. 24." Wheatley is not held in much esteem now by Ritualists, his knowledge of Ritual, though considerably in advance of most men in his day, is very meagre compared with modern writers. He has, however, a certain standing, at least among bishops and dignitaries, who wish to discourage Ritual. We may remark, by the way, the great change that has taken place in this respect; some twenty or thirty years ago, Wheatley was the great authority with High Churchmen, while bishops looked askance at him; now that Ritualists have got very much ahead of Wheatley, bishops are very glad to use his work, and shelter themselves under his name. We knew a case not long ago, where an archdeacon being scandalised by a rector of a country parish celebrating before the altar, wrote to remonstrate with him, finishing off his correspondence with a triumphant appeal to this very passage of Wheatley to show that "before the altar" meant at the north *end* of it. This was a very safe card to play; few country rectors have "Bev. Pandect." or "Renaudotius Lit." in their libraries; and, we may add, fewer still could find out what passage Wheatley referred to, so wide is his statement from what we find in either Beveridge or Renaudot. What Beveridge really says is this: that the "*right* side always means the north side," a very different matter, and one which is simply *nil ad rem*.

For general satisfaction we give the passage entire. It is from

the edition of 1672, and is from his "Iconographia," or description of an ancient church, volume, page, and section to which Wheatley refers: Beveridge's *Συνοδικόν*, sive *Pandectæ Canonum SS. Apostolorum*, tom. ii. Annot. p. 76 § xv.

"XV. Duo alia adhuc supersunt loca Bemati adjuncta, *Διακονικὸν* et *Πρόθεσις*, de quibus breviter agendum est. Et *διακονικὸν* quidem ad dextram Pontificis in throno sedentis et occidentem respicientis collocatur, *πρόθεσις* ad sinistram. Unde et pars ista ecclesiæ qua *διακονικὸν* statuitur *δεξιὸν μέρος* et *βορείον κλίτος* vocatur; qua *πρόθεσις* ἀριστερὸν μέρος et νότιον κλίτος. Et quidem *βορείον κλίτους* et *δεξιὸν μέρος*, passim, in Euchologio mentio occurrit; ut *ἐξέρχεται ἅμα τῷ ἱερεὶ διὰ τοῦ βορείου κλίτους*, egreditur [ex Bemate] una cum Sacerdote per boreale latus, in ord. S. Minist. Et in Liturgia Chrysostomi ὁ ἱερεὺς καὶ ὁ διάκονος . . . ἐξελθόντες διὰ τῆς θύρας τοῦ βορείου μέρους ἔρχονται εἰς τὸν συνήθη τόπον. E quibus simul perspicuum redditur in dicta septemtrionali parte portam etiam fuisse ex Bemate, ubi sancta mensa, ducentem. Quandoquidem autem Bema perpetuo ad orientalem Ecclesiæ partem exstructum est, et episcopus in eo sedet, respiciens occidentem, hic septemtrionem ad dextram, et austrum ad sinistram, semper habeat, necesse est; quo factum id *δεξιὸν μέρος* idem significat quod *βορείον κλίτος*, et *ἀριστερὸν μέρος* idem quod *νότιον κλίτος*."

This extract is quite sufficient to show how little Wheatley is to be relied upon as an authority. He sets himself to prove a foregone conclusion, and to advocate an existing custom which he must have known to be illegal.

KAY'S CRISIS HUPFELDIANA.

Crisis Hupfeldiana; being an Examination of Hupfeld's Criticisms on Genesis, as recently set forth by Bishop Colenso's Fifth Part.
By W. KAY, D.D., Fellow of Lincoln College, Oxford, and Principal of Bishop's College, Calcutta. Parker.

AMONG the irreverent criticisms of the present day, there are not any so subtle and dangerous as that which is exercised upon the Holy Name of God.

The HOLY GHOST, who recorded the earliest dealings of the Creator with His creature, Man, is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. And in all His words and works, there must be perfect harmony. Thus in the facts of His first Creation, may be distinctly traced the picture of the second. In the history of the Fall is uttered a mighty prophecy, which is in the course of

fulfilment through all time, and even to all eternity. According, therefore, to His own Will, God created all things in that precise order which best approved itself to His infinite Wisdom, and His records cannot possibly be at variance with His acts. The very Name by which He was pleased to announce Himself is unchangeable and full of significance. To regard it with especial reverence as the basis of all future Inspiration has been the custom of all God's people who honour Him. And thus we say that to the unhallowed freedom with which "critics" have discussed the nature and meaning of the Sacred Name of God, we may trace many of the unhappy speculations which prevail in this age of intellectual flux.

If the Almighty Creator had permitted error and imperfection to exist in the very first announcement of Himself, what warrant should we have to believe that any portion of the Divine Revelations as such is to be trusted? And then it follows that man could not rely on God Himself in Whom he discovered error and mistake. This question, of course, turns first upon the assumption by "critics" that the Bible is not the work of God at all, or, at least, that only certain portions, which they are capable of reconciling with human theories, proceed from God. Strange that such discernment was not in exercise till the 19th century. Strange, also, that in the Almighty economy, Mankind should have been so long taught to trust in an imperfect Bible. On this theory, the philosophy of the present day would really be called upon to create a new Bible to suit the intellectual exigencies of an advanced age! For, destroy the *Personal Agency* of God (which is done by the "critical" theories) and He becomes simply an Abstract Power, of whom it is impossible to know anything but through His works in Nature and His character as a Self-existent, far-off Creator. Thus, men of the 19th century who suppose that they have arrived at the zenith of scientific knowledge, would be, doubtless, more capable of understanding God, than those who lived 4,000 years ago. The great Lawgiver, Moses, would not, in any way, be able to compete with his "critical" judges.

But to come to Dr. Kay. His Examination of the Hupfeldian Criticisms will commend itself to all minds, who desire to retain their trust in, and reverence for, the Holy Bible. It is conducted with much skill and ability, and the abstruse points of Hebrew scholarship are handled with a clearness and delicacy, which evince both learning and veneration. His whole argument is based upon the hypothesis that Almighty God is the sole Author of all Scripture, and therefore that Man cannot by his circumscribed intellect measure the Divine mind. The creature, in fact, is supposed to be inferior to the Creator; and where human Reason is not capable of penetrating, it must yield to Faith. Dr. Kay's arguments may be summed up under two heads: (1) He proves

that the Hupfeld theory is built upon a wrong interpretation of the Hebrew text. (2) That assuming, for argument's sake, the conclusions of the Critical school to be right, they are altogether valueless, since they are entirely inconsistent with each other.

Thus Dr. Kay takes their supposed ground from under their feet, and then proves that it was no ground at all.

It is clear, if we reduce the arguments of Colenso, and others of his school, to their true value, we can find nothing in the whole course of literature more illogical. To take the pith of their own theory, it is simply this:—

(1.) If God is the Author of the Bible, His production is proved *by us* to be weak and contradictory; and not to be depended on; therefore, He is not the Author.

(2.) As different men, subject to human error, wrote the Bible in various ages of the world, it follows that, as a perfect production, the Scriptures must be far inferior to many human treatises which proceed from one well-balanced and experienced mind. And more fully to maintain this position, criticism does not scruple to call into existence authors which are merely the phantoms of their own brains, but which are apparently indispensable in order to reconcile inconsistencies, which, according to their theory, arise in the way. Dr. Kay thus describes the *rationale* of Colenso's process—“If the *facts* of the case are against him, *tant pis pour les faits*; they shall be altered.” And to sustain his own hypothesis, than which nothing can be so important in the “Critic's” eyes, he first creates authors, *ad libitum*, to fence his own position, and then charges *them* with

“*inadvertence, carelessness, waywardness, and other faults. So the pagan,*” continues Dr. Kay, “after creating an idol, has been known to revile, and even to scourge it, because it did not fulfil his desires.

“1. This is often done in terms of arrogant disrespect [by Colenso.]

“In *C. A.*, p. 14, Dr. Colenso quotes and ‘agrees with’ Hupfeld's remark, that the compiler ‘*has just written down here at once what came to his pen.*’

“Yes, sir,” pursues Dr. Kay, “it is very true; ‘the compiler’ is capable of doing what you have charged him with; for he is simply the creature of your own brain; and may *be* and *do* what you *will*. But please to remember what follows from this; he is the counterpart of yourself; the free and easy remarks you make of him must most surely come back upon you. ‘*De te fabula narratur.*’ The shortcomings of the ‘compiler’ are wholly yours. He is but your automaton. It is *you* that ‘write down at once what comes to your pen.’

“2. So, too, Dr. Colenso says (*C. A.*, p. 16) of another of his writers, that he ‘is here merely exercising his fancy upon’ an etymology.

“Again, *C. A.*, p. 81, ‘He *may* have written, ‘from thence’ *loosely, . . . merely to introduce his own interpolation.*’ (Cp. p. 62, and *C. A.*, p. 62.)

"And, *C. A.*, p. 206: 'He has *clumsily retained* the original words of E."

To this Dr. Kay answers: "The 'clumsiness' is, of course, wholly due to him who has produced it by attempting to sever the component parts of a living organic unity. Part the veins of a living body from the arteries, the nerves from the muscles, and then complain of your 'results' looking clumsy!"—Pp. 76, 77.

We give this quotation here because it affords a clear exposition of the extent and evil of so-called criticism, and evinces most clearly the danger of the first step in that direction, where Almighty God is the subject. It is but a repetition of the first temptation, of those beguiling words of the Serpent to Eve, "Ye shall not surely die. For God doth know that in the day ye eat thereof, then your eyes shall be opened, and ye shall be as gods." This speech, true in a certain sense, breathed forth the very essence of the Devil's existence, viz. *pride*, and aimed, we know, at nothing less than dethroning the Almighty, that there should no longer be One God, but many. Such was its subtle nature, that to Eve's mind, it appeared "desirable to be as God." But to follow out our author's arguments under the two heads specified above:—

I. The misinterpretation of the Hebrew text. Of this, we shall confine ourselves to one example, which we consider to be that which lies at the root of the evil, viz. the distinction between the Divine Names "ELOHIM," and "YAHVEH" (JEHOVAH.) That God, in His omniscience, had a mysterious purpose in choosing to be known under these two names, we might imagine would have been a difficulty to the Jew; but instead of this being the case, we find the Name "YAHVEH" was held by them in such deep reverence that even to mention it lightly was the greatest breach of Jewish piety. Indeed, the very purpose of the Law was summed up thus—"That thou mayst fear this glorious and awful Name, *Yahveh*, thy God."

To the Christian, however, all mystery regarding the Name of God is solved. By the coming of the Second Person of the Holy Trinity in the flesh, the personality of God is no longer a matter of Faith only: the eternal union of God and man in CHRIST is a Fact which can be accepted with the understanding even more really than when, in the days of man's innocency, the Creator walked and talked with our first parents in Paradise, for then God and man were two.

To follow Dr. Kay in substance: The distinction between the sacred Names does not appear to afford any difficulty to the reverent and devout mind, being but the expression of different *ideas* associated with one Divine Being. "ELOHIM," plainly, was given as the "general name" expressive of the power and majesty

of the Godhead Who created all things; while "YAHVEH" is given as the "personal name" by which God not only expresses His self-existent character, but is pleased to represent Himself in condescending intercourse with men as a God of mercy and faithfulness.

Thus as the promise to the woman's "Seed" after the Fall conveyed the idea of Restoration and New Birth, so the name "YAHVEH" pointed to mercy, and spake to Man of a Personal interest and Divine protection even greater than that which was enjoyed in Paradise, when "Elohim" held converse with Adam. "In that oft recurring phrase," (says Dr. Kay,) "I am YAHVEH your Elohim," it is clear that we could no more "transpose the two words than in the expression, 'I am 'Joseph' your 'brother.'"

We are not able here to enter fully as we could wish into the points of scholastic interest, which Dr. Kay sets against the paltry objections conjured up by Colenso. We cannot, therefore, do better than to give rather copious extracts from the book before us.

And, first, on the significance of the two sacred names he says:—

"In this way provision was made, from the first, for the maintenance of a pure and true theology among the Israelites. The name ELOHIM (plural in form, yet actually singular) was adapted to be a protest against *polytheistic* views;—in Him, the one God, all Divine Powers co-existed. Yet not as *Pantheism* sums up the forces of the Universe into one; for (said the name YAHVEH) He is a *Personal* God. And that this Personal Being was not 'a God afar off,' in the depths of Infinite space or of Absolute existence, was further ascertained by the words, 'I am YAHVEH, *thy* God;'—'who have placed Myself in a special and condescending relation to *thee*.'

"Here, I say, was provision made for a far deeper apprehension of the Divine character than any which unaided Reason, outside the circle of special Revelation, could possibly attain to.

"To illustrate this let me quote a passage from the work of a recent thoughtful writer, who is meditating on '*the Ways of God, in connexion with Providence and Redemption*,' without the slightest reference to the fact upon which we are now intent. He says: 'In this high and holy sphere of Moral Government, there must be results unattainable by the exercise of *one* Divine perfection, or *by Power alone*; and which would make it needful (to speak with reverence) *that the High and Lofty One, who inhabits Eternity, should unbosom the secrets of His heart*, and unfold all the rich diversity of His heavenly goodness, His patient long-suffering, His stern severity and deep compassion, before the view of the wondering universe.' Here we have philosophical speculation demanding that very distinction, for which the two Divine names in Hebrew have made provision. The general idea of Power, attached to ELOHIM, the Ruler of the universe, is not sufficient. There are infinite depths in the Divine Nature, which can

only be known as manifested in the *personal* dealings of GOD with man. That GOD *would* hold intercourse with man was guaranteed by the existence of the personal name, YAHVEH."—Pp. 1, 2.

Again, with regard to the evident object for the employment of these two names in Holy Scripture we think the following explanation enough to prove that the facts of the case are fatal to the theories of the Critical school :—

"Chap. i. and ii. 1—3, the name ELOHIM is used throughout :—for in it we have the exercise of that Divine Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, of which Heaven and Earth have been preaching to man ever since he first drew breath.

"In Chap. iv., when man has 'fallen short of the glory of GOD,' and can only be restored to it by the intervention of Divine Mercy, working out that long process of redemption and moral discipline in the midst of which we ourselves are still living, the name YAHVEH is employed. In this name 'mercy and judgment' are combined ; whilst GOD, in great condescension coming near to the first human family, accepts righteous Abel, warns and judges Cain.

"In the intermediate Section (ii. 4 . . . iii.) we have the two names *conjoined*, (*twenty* times ;—there is only one other place in the Pentateuch where this conjunction occurs, viz. Exod. ix. 30.) The introduction of the name YAHVEH corresponds to the advance made in the narrative ; which no longer exhibits man as standing amidst the works of Creation, but views him as a moral being, placed in a special relation to GOD as a loving FATHER, whose command he is bound by every tie of gratitude to obey.

"Just so in Ps. xix., the Sacred Name 'El' is used in the First Part, (vv. 1—6,) of which the sum is, 'The heavens declare the glory of GOD ;'—whilst the Second Part, beginning, 'The law of the LORD is perfect,' has only the name 'YAHVEH,' (*seven* times.)

"But whilst the use of the name YAHVEH indicates this advance, the name ELOHIM, employed in the former Chapter, is retained *in combination with it* ;—stamping for ever the correlation of the Two Names. He who is the gracious Saviour and Judge of men is none other than the Creator and Sustainer of the universe. Man's sin may, for awhile, require a severance between the Two Names. But Holy Scripture points to a time when the two shall be re-united, and all shall confess that '*The Lord God Omnipotent reigneth.*'

"Inside the Section ii. 4 . . . iii., however, we have a very instructive *variation* of the Name. In iii. 1—6, when the Tempter is conversing with Eve, the name 'Elohim' is used. 'Yea, hath GOD said?' The *more remote* name was certainly well suited to his purpose. It altered the *point of view*. It suggested some such train of thought as this : 'What? the *great Creator* care for your eating or not eating? He who made all things good,—can He have bidden you to abstain from what is good for food?' In other words, it removed the question away from the *moral*, to a speculative, rationalizing, point of view :—and how much was gained when that step was once taken!

"In Chap. v., (which, after reverting to the creation of man,

traces the descent of Noah from Adam,) the name 'ELOHIM' is again employed. The propriety of this scarcely needs to be pointed out. But at ver. 29 of this chapter, where allusion is made to the curse which had fallen on the ground for man's sin, 'YAHVEH' recurs. That sentence had all along been a mark of GOD's *righteous intolerance of sin*. Rather than leave sin unpunished, He will have the spread of physical beauty and fertility over the earth arrested. Paradise shall remain for the present an unprolific germ. The ground at large shall be cursed ;—in order that MAN may know that 'it is an evil and a bitter thing *to forsake the Lord*.'

"In the middle of Chap. v. we are told that Enoch 'walked with GOD:' and the same is said of Noah in vi. 9.

"On this latter passage it has been asked: 'Why should it be in ver. 8, 'Noah found grace in the eyes of the LORD,' and yet in ver. 9, 'Noah walked with GOD?' *Why not rather, 'walked with the Lord?'*"

"The answer is easy. When GOD condescends to *accept* His servant, 'YAHVEH,' the Name of gracious condescension, is the appropriate term. When Noah rises into *the Divine life*, conformed more and more to 'the image of *Him who created him*,' 'GOD' is the appropriate word.—For a like reason, we find always, 'a man of GOD,' 'sons of GOD,' (never, 'a man of the LORD,' or 'sons of the LORD.')"—Pp. 14—16.

This proves indisputably to believers that the harmonious use of the two holy names binds the Bible itself into an indissoluble unity, which no theories of diverse authorship are able to sever. That the varying use of "Elohim" and "YAHVEH" was the ground upon which the "Dismemberment theory took its stand, is shown plainly by the names given to the imaginary authors of documents in the Book of Genesis, viz. 'Elohist,' 'Second Elohist,' 'Jehovist,' and 'Second Jehovist.'"

II. But grant *for the time* the "critical" hypothesis, and what follows? Nothing but confusion and contradiction, and the total absence of all fixedness.

The hypothesis is contrary to facts, and is therefore entirely valueless. The following extract is strikingly conclusive :—

"We have not, however, yet reached the acme of 'critical' self-exposure.' At p. 193 Dr. Colenso writes as follows :—

"'In J³ we find another step taken in the same direction. The name 'Jehovah' has now, in the latter part of David's reign, become more freely and popularly used; and the writer determines to introduce it at once in his story from the first, *not considering, apparently, or not regarding as of any moment, the contradiction which would thus be imported into the narrative*. And, indeed, having already begun to employ it in his previous insertions (J²) perhaps he may have thought it best to do this,—*abandoning the Elohist idea of the origination of the name in the time of Moses*, and representing it as known from the days of the first man downwards. But in order to guard against any mistake, he PERTINACIOUSLY couples the two names together, 'Jehovah—Elohim,' in ii. 4^b—iii. 24 *twenty times*, as if desiring to impress

strongly on the reader that the 'Jehovah,' of whom he was about to write, was the same exactly as the 'Elohim' of the older writer.'

"He *pertinaciously* couples the two names together, *twenty times* ! What stubborn wilfulness,—to throw so serious a difficulty in the way of men who 3,000 years later, in order to prove the book to be 'unhistorical,' might try to introduce the notion that these names were marks of diverse authorship !

"But '*pertinaciously*' intent as this writer was on 'guarding against mistake' on this head, yet—strange to say—he allows a passage to remain uncorrected, which (on Dr. Colenso's hypothesis) 'imports' a glaring '*contradiction*' into the narrative, and that respecting a subject of vital importance. But he did not 'consider,' or did not 'regard as of any moment,' the existence of this contradiction,—although the one grand distinguishing peculiarity that *made* him a 'Jehovist' was that he had '*abandoned the Elohist idea* of the origination of the Name in the time of Moses.'

"Such are the puerilities, which 'criticism' parades before the world, as the means of overthrowing the 'historical' character of the Book of Genesis. Will it succeed ?"—Pp. 27, 28.

It is certain that a perfect unity of thought, purpose, and action must ever characterise God. And unless we recognise the God of Moses, in CHRIST, reconciling the lost world unto Himself,—unless we acknowledge in CHRIST the only-begotten SON Who dwelt in the Bosom of the FATHER before all worlds,—we cannot rightly accept the doctrine of the Incarnation, and we cannot build a right faith ; for, says CHRIST, "upon this Rock will I build My Church :"—from Myself, as Incarnate God, shall be raised a Living Temple, which shall reach from earth to heaven, and endure to all eternity. Had the Jews acknowledged the God of Abraham in CHRIST, they would not have crucified Him. Did Colenso and others recognise the Divine origin of Holy Scripture, they could not seek to interpret it by algebraic rule. It is, we conceive, most extraordinary, despite the elasticity of the critical rule, that men can persist in a course which evidently baffles all their own ingenuity and audacity. Their criterions fail entirely to establish any definite system ; and though they create new authors, and invent a false premiss when they please in order to carry out their theories, yet the Bible remains inseparably one. There can be found no trace of a seam ; it is "woven from the top throughout."

To come now to another point in the argument, viz., the satisfactory method in which Dr. Kay meets the false statements of Colenso, in his attempts to prove that diversity of style implies difference of author.

Colenso's idea of style is altogether different to anything which we should consider characteristic. He argues that

"the recurrence of the same words constitutes identity of style ; the

want of such recurrence implies difference of style ;—difference of style in such a sense as compels us to infer diversity of authorship. Each writer is supposed to have at his disposal a limited number of 'formulæ,' (p. 27,) within the range of which he must work. He *must* in each chapter employ these 'formulæ,' and these only. He must be content with one small portion of his mother-tongue, and not dare to venture across the limits of that portion—on pain of losing his identity. Consequently, (on Dr. Colenso's hypothesis,) if I find words present in one part of a book which are absent from another part, I am warranted in concluding that these two parts were written by different authors." —P. 34.

But, to see how the test is applied by "critics," and refuted by Dr. Kay.

In the hands of Dr. Colenso the test admits of every shade of stringency and laxity, to suit his own purposes :—

"(A) In some cases, the most ordinary words or phrases are diligently collected, and treated with high respect as proofs of *identity* of authorship ; whilst the slightest possible variations are insisted upon as marks of *diversity*. (B) In other cases the evidence of really important words and phrases is set aside with the stroke of the pen.

"2. Instances of (A) need scarcely be produced. They meet one on every page. Let the following serve as specimens :—

"At pp. 74—76, e.g., we find 'therefore,' 'wash your feet,' 'your servant,' 'do evil,' 'thy soul,' 'except,' 'that night,' used as marks of the 'Jehovistic' character of ch. xix.

"But at p. 38 he remarks :—

"i. v. 1. 'And these are the generations of the *sons of Noah*.' No formula like this occurs among the E formulæ in (2. iii.) and E *would hardly have written this, INASMUCH AS he writes* in xi. 10, 'these are the generations of Shem.'"

"The authors he has pictured to himself must have been indeed cast-iron puppets,—of less ability than the 'calculating machine,'—if their power of varying their 'formulæ' did not extend far enough to allow of their introducing such a change as this.

"As instances of (B) take the following :—

"(a) The occurrence of some words and phrases, which the 'critics' have considered to be 'Elohistic,' has led Knobel and Delitzsch to assign ch. xxxiv. to E. Dr. Colenso admits that 'the coincidences [in ver. 23] are certainly remarkable.' The word לִיָּדָה, in particular, a rare word, occurs only in two other places in the Pentateuch, and both these are in portions assigned to E. But then, says Dr. Colenso, with unwonted keenness of vision, 'the fact that E has it *twice*, cannot be sufficient to assure it to him as *exclusively* Elohistic.'

"So too the word וַיִּשְׁלַח in ver. 2 is used in three other places of Genesis by E, by J not once.

"But Dr. Colenso is inexorable. 'The whole chapter belongs to J.'

"(b) The verb בָּסַח, which occurs in Genesis only in the (supposed)

'Jehovistic' passages, is found also in the section, xxxv. 16—20; and Hupfeld actually assigns this section to J. Dr. Colenso, however, will have it belong to E, and remarks that the word *YD*

'does not, indeed, occur in any other passage of E in Genesis;—*but merely*, it would seem, *because this writer has not required to use it*. . . . It is, in fact, the word that he would naturally use, if he wanted to express the breaking up of an encampment.'

"If this (very obvious) reflection were but fairly carried out, it would destroy the theory on which the pretended 'Analysis' rests."—Pp. 43, 44.

We have given this short chapter in full, because, in the first place, we consider that it is not only a specimen of the style of Dr. Kay's arguments, but it shows most clearly the absurdity of the system that attempts a critical analysis of Holy Scripture upon any human rationale whatsoever. Most truly says Dr. Kay, that the authors conjured up in the brain of the mathematician are but "cast-iron puppets, of less ability than the calculating machine." The latter would be capable of regulation, to suit any result; but, try all he will, Dr. Colenso cannot make his machinery work with any degree of uniformity. And the more he tries to regulate his machine, the more complicated the works become. In fact, he has no sooner established to his satisfaction the fact that a certain word or verse is "Elohistic" on a given theory, than two verses further, upon the same theory, he is compelled to acknowledge that, to all appearance, it ought to have been "Jehovistic;" but nevertheless, as he has said so, it is "Elohistic." This is the style of reasoning by which the "analyst" gets his results. He has no well-defined principle whereon to build his opinions. If it is inconvenient that 2×2 should be 4, why it shall be 5, or 6. If a word is uncomfortably prominent where it should be wanting, why, take it away altogether, and put it in some other place where it is wanted, or even where it is not wanted. And if a place cannot conveniently be found for it, supply another word or sentence; introduce the *right* word, which was evidently left out through carelessness on the part of the writer!

And this is the Bible, God's own revelation, that is thus put to the test (!) and found wanting. If we put our trust in the Hupfeld theory, we certainly should not reverence the Scriptures. One might as well trust in the honesty of a confirmed thief as look for perfection in a volume which is made up by such writers as Colenso imagines. But before the one only test, viz., the divine origin of the whole Bible, all spurious criticisms crumble into dust. The variation of the sacred name is significant only of Almighty wisdom and love. The attempt to prove diversity of authorship leads only into an endless labyrinth of unbelief on the one side, and

finally abolishes the fact of unity on the other. The entire ground upon which the investigations of "criticism" are carried on, may be summed up, says Dr. Kay, thus :

"So, then, you tell us to determine the documents, by means of the words, and the words by means of the documents; a plainly vicious circle of investigation. Yet this is the staple of your 'Analysis.'"—P. 46.

And this is all we have to contend with: illogical, uncritical, unhistorical arguments. For the yet heavier charge which Dr. Kay brings against the Theorists, is simply equal to an acknowledgment that the Bible, as it is, cannot possibly be disintegrated. We give the author's words—

"Whenever other means of evasion fail, the 'Critics' habitually resort to suppositions of a writer's having *meant to cancel something which is in the text*; having written something which *is not in the text*; having been guilty of oversight, inadvertence, and even plain self-contradiction. They cut up a single verse into two or more fragments. If this be found insufficient, then—any arbitrary fancy whatever is resorted to as proof."—P. 73.

Thus we find no consistency between the various parts of the documents produced by the so-called different authors. No coherency or even connection in the details, e.g., one part of document E is made to run thus :

"All the men of his house,—house-born or the purchase of silver, or of the son of a foreigner—*were circumcised with him*. And it came to pass, when God destroyed the cities of the plain, that God remembered Abraham, and sent forth Lot from the midst of the overthrow."—P. 83.

And this is the choice reward that Rationalism offers to her toiling servants, even a barren and disjointed Bible! The histories of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, David, and others, underlying which holy men have seen Almighty truths from the earliest ages, must be regarded as defective and unhistorical. Truly, we have little to fear from this Pseudo-Criticism.

But to conclude; we consider that the most striking proof of the authenticity of the Pentateuch (if we needed proof,) is its consistent account of the Jewish people, and their implicit faith in, and reverence for it as God's revelation to them. This is, says Dr. Kay, a miracle which no amount of scepticism can get rid of—and without the Pentateuch all Jewish history is inexplicable.

"Admit the authenticity of the Pentateuch and all is solved. Deny it, and all is impenetrably dark. One of the most conspicuous facts of history, namely, the existence of a pure religion for fourteen centuries

among a people not less naturally prone than the rest of the world to sensual idolatry, has *no* explanation. Other miracles, which affected the physical world for brief intervals of time, may be got rid of;—this enduring miracle in the sphere of spiritual life cannot.”—P. 93.

To do full justice to the book before us, is not possible here, as we have said. But the skill of the author is evident in any one page of his work, and to an unprejudiced mind, the smallest evidence he adduces against Rationalistic conclusions (which occupy volumes,) is sufficient to refute them. The book contains but ninety-three pages; and few things evince learning and ability so much as that power of condensing a large subject, and producing a concise and comprehensive result.

One more remark, and we take leave of Dr. Kay. To judge simply of the Pentateuch by the light of reason only—we believe it impossible to acquiesce in the measures resorted to by pseudo-rationalistic criticism. For no one reading the five Books in question can be other than convinced that there is one and the same author for all: and further, that this author is fully conversant with all Egyptian literature and customs. The Egyptian spirit penetrates every line; in fact, the tone and style are so essentially Egyptian that no one who was not intimately acquainted with the laws, institutions, language, arts, and sciences of Egypt could have written them. Thus, even on uninspired ground, we should not have any reason to doubt that Moses, who was better versed in all the literature of Egypt than any other, was the author of those Books which have been called after his name for nearly four thousand years! But, setting aside all mere reasonable grounds, and considering only the highest possible incentives to reverence, upon which mankind has been accustomed to receive the Bible, viz. as a Revelation proceeding from God Himself; it follows that the inspired penmen, who are none other than His mouthpieces, cannot make mistakes, and could not therefore have conveyed a wrong impression to the minds of God's people with regard to the human means through whom it pleased the HOLY GHOST to speak. The whole theory of Hupfeld is without foundation and really therefore tends to prove the divine origin of the Bible. No Israelite was ever known to question the fact of Moses being the inspired medium through whom the Pentateuch was given, and no Christian can do so without undermining Revelation altogether.

POEMS BY PLUMPTRE AND OTHERS.

1. *Master and Scholar*, &c. &c. By the Rev. E. H. PLUMPTRE, M.A. London: Strahan.
2. *River Reeds*. London: Masters.
3. *Ecce Homines*. London: Adams and Francis.

ROGER Bacon—the Franciscan, the “Doctor Mirabilis,” whose lot it was (we may not call it his misfortune) to

“antedate his mission
In an unprepared season,”

and thus to draw down upon himself misunderstandings and distrust and censure—is the subject of the fine and touching poem which gives its title to Mr. Plumptre’s new volume. It is a subject which gives free scope to the poetic powers; it is easy to imagine how a temptation to unfaith would arise, *not* from the knowledge of Nature, and of the God alike of Nature and Revelation, Whom unseen we yet trace in the things which are seen, but from the suspicion to which he was subjected at the hands of narrower men than himself. It was hard for a “Hebrew of the Hebrews,” a Franciscan of the Franciscans, to find himself branded as infidel, magician, heretic, because his brain had grasped, and his industry worked out, some of the laws which the Almighty Creator has imposed upon His universe. What wonder that he lost his faith—if not in God, at least in Man—and acquired that tinge of cynicism and misanthropy and moodiness which mars his history? Into all this Mr. Plumptre has entered, as every poet, to be successful, must enter into his subject; and if a word here and there is made to fall from the Friar’s lips which we feel inclined to think the Friar would never have spoken, yet, on the whole, Roger Bacon stands out before us a very living and, we think, a very true picture, and the poem is one which will touch many minds.

We subjoin a passage from the closing scene of his life, when a disciple—whom some twenty years before he had sent to lay the fruit of his labours before the Pope—is with him once again, to soothe his last moments and close his eyes:—

“The age to come
Of which I see the promise clear and bright
Like yon fair streaks which in the distant East
Tell of the day-star’s dawn, shall do the work
To which your hands were set, and men shall own
In you the first to light the lamp of truth,
To give the promise of a Church renewed,

A life at one with God. In that blest hope
 I die at peace. I shall not see those days ;
 But as the seer stood once on Pisgah's height,
 Looking on plains and rivers, woods and hills,
 All Jordan's windings, Shechem's pleasant vale,
 Fair Carmel in the west, so stand I now
 Upon my watch-tower, and behold in faith
 The King in all His beauty, with His Bride,
 Bright as the eternal morning. So I find
 My own poor life transfigured. If I look
 Back on the past, I see but wasted years,
 The vexing wanderings of a vain research
 For things that did not profit. All my cry
 In hour of death and at the judgment seat,
 Were I to gaze upon that past alone,
 Would be but one long wailing of despair :
 'O LORD our GOD ! we sin exceedingly ;'
 But He, the King, forgives me all that debt,
 And in the ocean of His tideless love
 I plunge and rise, new-born, to higher life,
 And the low moan gives way to songs of praise,
 As when the Elders round the golden throne
 Cast their bright crowns upon the crystal sea,
 So peace has come at last."—Pp. 44, 45.

Another very striking poem is "Miriam of Magdala," though we cannot lay on one side the tradition which has always considered "the woman that was a sinner," and her "out of whom went seven devils," as being one and the same person, viz. S. Mary Magdalene, and we feel that the theory of their dissociation from each other is no gain, but in many respects a loss, and takes away the grand crown of penitence, which the history of the Resurrection otherwise teaches. The delineation of Miriam of Magdala's character is, nevertheless, very perfect, and the poem is a good companion to "Jesus Barabbas" of the author's preceding volume. "An Old Story," has for its subject, "Heloise and Abelard," and is marked by the same insight into the minds of his subjects, which we have noted as the characteristic of "Master and Scholar."

As a rule our author's blank verse runs more smoothly and musically than his efforts at a lighter style. The latter are laboured when they should be free, and the writer seems crippled by his self-imposed bonds ; his accents try him, and though he is far too correct to be guilty of a false rhyme, yet there is a painful feeling that for the sake of rhyme we meet with expressions and words which never flowed spontaneously from the inspiration of the poet. On the whole, however, this collection is superior to "Lazarus;" and if we still miss from the author's writings the highest strain, that pure abandonment of self to the spirit of poetry, which evidences

the truest poets ; yet in the finish, and refinement, and ease, which mark his work, we receive some compensation. Besides those we have mentioned, our readers will find several other poems in the volume, which will amply repay reading ; and the translations are spirited and poetical.

The two small volumes which follow, not a little alike in outward appearance, and resembling each other also in the fact that both contain some real poetry—have yet struck us chiefly by the strong contrast the one affords to the other in thought, and fancy, and diction. The first is a collection of graceful verses, some of deep pathos, some of high devotion, and all finished and poetical. Occasionally the deep problems of human thought are touched upon, but it is in a comfortable, *débonnaire* way, not as if the writer's mind had any experimental knowledge of the doubts and struggles described, and thus the poems of this kind are less real than the lighter ones in the volume, whose great charm is their soft pathos and tenderness. But in "Ecce Homines" there is seen the strong struggle which shakes many and many a human mind to its very base ; and blessed is the man who, after that terrible earthquake, hears the still small voice of Eternal Truth, and finds his peace. The poems which we meet with in this little volume have little grace or pathos, but they are full of strong suffering, and deep, real, and fervent love ; and we can welcome them as likely to do some good, as showing doubting and troubled minds where only rest can be found. "Fecisti nos propter Te, et inquietum est cor nostrum donec requiescat in Te."

The main poem, "A Life's Quest," describes a man with keen intellect and all earthly advantages, walking through the "dry places" of doubt, and human love, of philanthropical efforts for others, and unsanctified sorrow, and finding no rest.

Our readers will appreciate the concluding portion, which describes the death-bed of this same man who at length found his peace in God.

"O! Anselm, my best angel—best beloved
Of best beloved sons of men—I see
At last in this dim twilight of the world,
When sense with all her sons of substance yields
To deeper truths of spirit, and my soul
Gets insight of the mystery of life—
I see that thou wert right—that even good
Is not a good, unless it spring from love
Of Him of Whom it is the shadow, God,
And that dear SON Who knit us unto Him.
E'en at this hour—as substance fades from view,
And from the narrowness of life I drift
Away into the infinite of death—
E'en at this hour, if mercy may be giv'n

To one who loving yet hath sinn'd so much—
 If this last breaking of a wilful heart
 May count for penitence, and infinite love
 Can find a corner for my humbled soul—
 Then—priest of the Great Priest who bore for men
 The pangs of mixed divinity and flesh
 In reconciling torment—plead for me !

“ To whom the kneeling priest : ‘ O brother mine—
 Brother by bonds of love more near than blood—
 Whilst if God willed it, I could weep away
 My soul in utmost anguish at the thought
 Of that which comes to part us ; whilst my heart
 Throbs with large selfishness of love, which fain
 Would keep thee ever by me, and results
 Into grim darkness at the approach of death—
 Yet, my dear brother, even thus late to hear
 The words of human penitence, and desire
 Towards the heavenly, fills me with such joy
 As brings a smile upon the face of woe,
 And cheats death of his bitterness ; may God,
 Compassionate of His creatures, grant to thee—
 Brother in life, but now in death my son—
 The mercy of His grace ; for long, long years
 Wrestling in prayer for thee, my soul hath striven
 In passionate eagerness with God—at last
 Forth from the grave now yawning, whence I look'd
 For nothing but despair, the freshest hope
 Leaps like a new-born babe—for this, and all
 Thy countless benefits, I thank Thee, God !’

“ ‘ And thou hast pled for me—thou faithful one !—
 Full well I knew it, though I never touch'd
 So delicate a chord, lest our great love,
 That buoy'd me in the ocean of the world,
 Should part and leave me but the half I was.
 Now most of all I need thee—plead for me
 Again, again, and win for me a place
 Where we may be together after death.
 Thou know'st my sins as thou hast known my love—
 Here I confess them—shrive me if thou canst.’

“ And Anselm, wrung with sorrow and yet calm,
 As conscious of his awful power, bent down
 And whisper'd, as he held CHRIST'S symbol'd love
 Before the eyes of him whose parting soul
 Fluttered to rest thereon,—the wearied dove
 Returning to its ark,—‘ ABSOLVO TE !’

“ And, as he gaz'd, he knew that his arm held
 What once was Herbert and was now but clay.”—Pp. 69—72.

"Thee Alone" we will also give, as a specimen of the writer's devotional tone.

"I own no wish, no thought, O LORD, but Thee ;
Thou art my All, and fain upon Thy breast
Would I, in faith reclining, be at rest,
Bound by that cord of love which maketh free.

"O! my sweet SAVIOUR, suffer me to draw,
Weak, way-worn, helpless, yet a little nigher,
To warm my sin-chilled limbs by Love's own fire,
And read my pardon for Thy broken law.

"I purpose nothing save what Thou dost bid—
I think of nothing save what Thou hast thought—
I pray for nothing that Thou hast not taught—
I search for nothing that Thy Love has hid.

"I am no more myself—what once I knew
I know not now—what once I did not know,
Thou in Thy wisdom hast been pleased to show,
Till Sense misleads no more, but Faith shines true.

"Fair JESU, grant me yet another grace—
Take pity on the craving that remains
So long as red life circles in my veins ;—
Hasten the time when I shall see Thy face!"—Pp. 91, 92.

We must find room for one more extract, which puts the imaginative powers of this writer, whom we hope to see again in print, in a very favourable point of view.

"They took from the Cross that God-like Form—
They took it while it was lithe and warm—
They folded its arms upon its breast,
And wrapp'd it in linen meet for rest ;
And one from afar was watching.

"They bore Him away to the garden near,
And laid Him down with sorrow and fear
In the white new tomb in the rock hard by,
And some of them longed with Him to die ;
While one from afar kept watching.

"Feeling as men of their all bereft,
In the rough-hewn stone their LORD they left,
And weeping and wailing, with chastened heart,
They felt that the time was come to part ;
And the stranger still kept watching.

"Dark was the robe that wrapp'd him round,
And his foot seemed ever to mock the ground,

So crafty and light was his thief-like tread,
As he stole to the spot where lay the dead,
Whom Heaven and Hell were watching.

“ Dark grew the night and darker still
On the side of that rocky desolate hill,
As the stranger came to the place of death
And stood by the tomb with rein'd-in breath ;
Whilst Heaven and Hell were watching.

“ A moment he paused, and the startled blood
Rushed to his heart in a curdling flood,
As he vowed a vow that he yet would dare,
Displacing the stone, to enter there,
Though Heaven and Hell were watching !

“ Again, again, with a giant's strength,
He shook the mighty stone—at length
He thrust it aside :—from the broken gloom
Shone the moon on a sudden above the tomb,
Whilst Heaven and Hell were watching.

“ Far into the tomb the moonbeams sped,
And played round the Awful Sleeper's head ;
One look on that face the stranger cast—
One terrible look—and the moonlight pass'd,
Whilst Heaven and Hell were watching.

“ On his own dark brow the blackness of Hell,
Like a cloud on a mountain summit fell ;
He rolled back the stone with strength amain,
But cast not a glance on the tomb again ;
For Heaven and Hell were watching.

“ Next morn through the city a rumour ran,
That in Judas' field was hanging a man ;
And the Nazarenes knew as they looked on the face
That the Traitor was gone to his own dread place—
The Hell that had long been watching !”—Pp. 93—95.

And now in justice to our other author, we give one specimen,
a poem, entitled “The Maries.”

“ Close to the Cross, where crucified,
The LORD of glory hung and died,
Two women watching side by side
In deepest sorrow stood.

“ The one, a Virgin, chaste and mild,
The other, once by sin defiled,
Now to her Maker reconciled
Through CHRIST's redeeming blood.

" Mary, the good and innocent ;
And Magdalen the penitent,
Her lowly eyes in anguish bent
Upon the bloodstained sod.

" These two were privileged to be
Witnesses of His agony,
Who bore for us upon the tree
The anger of His God.

" So now by this same LORD's command,
Pure love, and penitence may stand
Like these, together, hand in hand
Beside the holy rood.

" And He who died for sinful men,
Who pardoned Mary Magdalen,
Will pardon now as He did then
All those who pardon would.

" Beneath His Cross there still is rest
For all the guilty and distressed,
And weary ones with woes oppressed,
He soothes, for He is good.

" Haste then with Magdalen to fly
To the dear Cross of Calvary,
For you the SAVIOUR deigned to die,
For you He shed His blood.

" The guilty soul, the burdened mind,
Pardon and comfort there may find,
And leave their sins and griefs behind,
Nailed to the sacred wood."—Pp. 51, 52.

CARTER'S LIFE OF PENITENCE.

The Life of Penitence. A Series of Lectures delivered at All Saints', Margaret Street. By the Rev. T. T. CARTER, Rector of Clewer. Masters, London.

AN analysis of the "Life of Penitence" from such a master hand as that of Mr. Carter, could not fail to be most valuable both to those who feel—and who does not?—the great difficulty of the work of repentance, and to all whose duty it is to be the guides of conscience. But there is one peculiar aspect of the book which strikes us very forcibly, and that is the remarkable testimony it bears to the Divine truth of real Catholic teaching as contrasted with the

"Religion Made Easy," of the school which considers that a mental act of belief once made is all that is requisite. For salvation in some instances it may be, but never for perfection.

In the first lecture, Mr. Carter proves that penitence must be life-long, because the knowledge of sin deepens with the advance of the soul in holiness, and as struggling onward it draws nearer and nearer to the Fount of all Goodness, the hatred of evil, and the remorse for evil acts of the past must always strengthen, till, it may be, the deepest act of penitence will be in the first revelation after death of the unveiled purity of the Incarnate God.

He shows also how we may trace the very same progress of the knowledge of sin in Holy Scripture, which is experienced in our personal consciousness. We have, he says, in its records a progressive series of revelations beginning with the simple fact of disobedience, and followed by the many dreadful signs of the continued increase and working of sin, till at last in the teaching of Him Who probed the secret thoughts and condemned the first germ of evil desires, the inward seat and enormity of the dark disease is fully revealed, and "the knowledge of the true nature of sin is the final result of the gradual development of the Divine dispensations." Mr. Carter then draws out the parallel with our human experience in the following beautiful words :—

"In this very same order sin reveals itself to the sinner's soul. At first it is felt only as a simple fact, as in a child's history unexplained, unintelligible, with an instinctive sense of shame indeed, but without any consciousness or discernment of its causes, or its real horror. As life grows, the outward consequences of sin are felt—the evils which it produces, as they act on others who are dear to us, or react on oneself. Later still, and then only by little and little, the inward working of sin, its secret springs, its hidden power, the disordered elements of the soul itself, become revealed to the consciousness. As we live on, the advancing inner revelation becomes increasingly clearer, and more appalling. It still grows more deeply, more intensely perceptible as the end approaches ; and on the bed of death, before the glazing eye, even though the soul be full of peace in the atoning Blood, though the vision of the very Face of God has become all the brighter and more assuring, yet, even because of that very light, and its intenser brightness, sin at the close of life appears yet more exceeding sinful, even to the Saint. If penitence deepens as the sense of sin becomes more vivid, so with advancing life there will be an ever-advancing penitence.

"Shall we venture further into the mystery of life, and attempt to realise the consciousness of the soul in this respect after death ? There will be assuredly, to the faithful, rest in the clear vision of the LORD, —the full, unchangeable assurance of peace, the ring, the kiss, the best robe, the feast, the intense rejoicing ; but in the fire of that illumination which will cleanse away the remains of sin, blotting out, we may trust, at last the very faintest records of it from the memory,—yet we may surely believe, that as sin will only then, in the full blaze

of the Face of GOD appear in its full horror, so penitence will then take its profoundest and tenderest form. Only then will penitence, as only then will sanctity, be complete,—complete when the last absolution from the lips of the Son of Man Himself shall fill the soul with the untold rapture of its final most restful assurance, doing away for ever the possibility of a relapse,—the voice from the Judgment Throne sealing the accomplished predestination of GOD.”—Pp. 7, 8.

In the second lecture, which is perhaps one of the most beautiful, Mr. Carter shows that forgiving love must ever be the strongest incentive to repentance, not the immediate sense of one act of forgiveness, as some would teach, but “the growing consciousness of forgiveness as a perpetual act of GOD through the continued offering of His own sacrifice.”

Speaking of the main causes why the remorseful sense of sin is stirred by the sight of the atoning sufferings of CHRIST, he has the following touching passage :—

“(1) Sin changed the life of the Incarnation. To take the flesh of man, must have been at all events humiliation to GOD, beyond all that we can conceive. But this union, this newly assumed life, might have been painless, might never have tasted sorrow, never shrunk with shame, never bowed beneath the burden of the faintest struggle. In one undimmed, undisturbed progress from glory to glory of the shining out of the Hidden Majesty of Godhead through the extremest beauty of perfected Humanity, He might have passed, and in Him all who are His, through a novitiate of unclouded bliss in man's first Paradise, the outer tabernacle of Heaven, until the time had come for the entrance into the innermost Presence, where GOD is All in all. But sin superinduced the dreadful Passion, and the Blood of the atoning Sacrifice. And as the sinner now looks at the prostrate Form in agony, or on the torn back, or on the gashed forehead, or at the Face streaming with gore; or inwardly at the bleeding, fainting, breaking, Heart,—he moans out its bitter lament, ‘My sin has done it.’ The life of my GOD on earth in my nature would have been all peace, all light, all joy, all rest. But through my sin it became a struggle, a desolation, a darkness, and an agony of death.

“(2) Again, sin is the continual renewal of the Passion. Many think that the crucifixion is wholly an event of the past, that our LORD then passed beyond the reach of human malice, or a creature's treachery. Outwardly He surely did so. He passed into an inner spiritual sphere, beyond the touch of this outer world. But there is an inward sense, through which He still feels the influence of what passes on earth. There is still a piercing of His Heart in His secret abode of peace; and the Passion may be renewed, and the wounds may bleed afresh, and the Head may again be bowed in humiliation. We may ‘crucify the SON of GOD afresh, and put Him to an open shame.’ Not to speak of deadly sins of malice, and recklessness, and unbelief,—even as mere carelessness steals over the soul's life, and love waxes cold, and some fresh fault is permitted, it is as though we were still repeating the cry,

'Crucify Him, crucify Him.' We have forgotten what sin has cost. We are entailing the necessity of a fresh Sacrifice of Atonement. The precious Blood is gushing out again to cleanse that renewed guilt away."—Pp. 21—23.

The third lecture on "The Reproof of the Spirit the power of Conversion," gives an able exposition of the Catholic view of that special awakening of conscience which occurs at some time to most earnest persons, and is so fatally interpreted by certain teachers to be a "seal of the Spirit," ensuring final perseverance. This sudden renewal, as it may fitly be called, is accompanied, Mr. Carter affirms, in every really quickened soul, with the deep conviction that there is sin remaining and underlying all, and that the very condition of advance is the seeing sins undiscerned before, and understanding faults which never formerly appeared to be such at all. So strong does he declare this deepening sense of sin to be, that the first penitence in course of time appears to have been only hypocrisy, or at least an utter falling short of what our actual guilt required, and the increasing power of the reproof of the Spirit, is only proved even to ourselves by the growing effort to overcome the actual working of sin within the soul.

"By what sign, then, can we discern a true from a false penitence? It is by the cutting off, actually and effectually mortifying in ourselves, whatever we discern to be the cause of sin, that which fomented it, what causes it to subsist; by removing what S. Paul calls 'the body of sin,' its matter, its form within us; by striking at the weakness which, yielding, causes sin. It is by the renunciation of the manifold seductive enthralling objects and influences which to the carnal mind form the false sweetness of life; by fleeing the occasions which excite in our hearts the poisonous desires; by the severe determination, the sacred violence which forces the soul from the enchanted spell of vanity, or lust, or sloth, or pride, or self-love, with which the syren's harp charms the conscience to sleep, and leads the higher nature of the child of God as a willing captive in its train of voluptuous votaries. In a word, it is that circumcision of the heart, which not pausing at a mere superficial change of outward action, strips from off the inner sensitive heart that clinging besetting disposition, which to the individual soul is the whole cause and origin of the sin."—P. 40.

How different is this teaching from the fatal doctrine that once the sinner is converted, nothing more is required of him.

The next lecture which is especially valuable, is on Confession. Mr. Carter proves to us that even in the penitent's shame, our LORD Himself has been a sharer. He accepted it, he declares, in the rite of circumcision, wherein He sealed Himself to be for ever associated with the line of sinners, as one of themselves; and further, to use Mr. Carter's words, "the vision which presents itself to us is that of God as a penitent for sins indeed not His own, but as

though they were His own." We are shown in this lecture how our great liability to dishonesty about ourselves, and to self-deceit, renders confession to a priest so advisable; and further, that it is "a most merciful dispensation of Divine love, one we can scarce doubt, flowing from the Incarnation of God and the law which has determined the transmission of all grace through the ministries of a manhood hypostatically one with Deity, that his brethren in the flesh, men of like passions and infirmities with himself, are set to be the hearers and judges of the records of the sinner's conscience, even as they are ordained to be the conveyers of the promised blessing of Divine forgiveness."

The cautions and warnings which follow as to the use of frequent confession are admirable.

The fifth lecture is on the confessedly difficult subject of satisfaction. The practical settling of this question for each individual soul must depend so entirely on temperament and other circumstances personal to itself alone, that it is hardly possible that a treatise which can only generalize on the matter should be altogether satisfactory; but we do not doubt that to many the hints contained in this portion of the volume will be extremely useful. The last lecture on "Amendment of Life," is pre-eminently valuable; and we will conclude our brief resumé—given throughout almost entirely in the author's own words—of a book which ought not only to be read, but to be studied with prayer and meditation, by giving Mr. Carter's statement of what he considers to be the two chief practical tests of spiritual progress.

"The practical amendment of life needs great definiteness. Definite tests are requisite in order to measure its reality, and its power. The two following tests are suggested, as being applicable to every form of life. First, it is not enough that a besetting sin be overcome; it is necessary to a true conversion, that the sin be replaced by its opposite virtue. Moses is an instance of this complete change. His early history marks him as naturally a man of a high impetuous temper. His slaying the Egyptian, and then the charge of his Hebrew brother, —'Intendest thou to kill me, as thou killedst the Egyptian?' prove this. But years of solitary musing and adversity in the wilderness, and revelations of God passing before his mind, had worked a transformation of character; and Scripture records of him in later life, that he was 'the meekest man in all the earth.' Not only had the impetuous undisciplined temper been subdued, it had given way to its opposite grace. And yet as a warning to show the strength of the original passion, and the possibility of the return of the long-past evil, unless still watched against, even in a state of grace, his fall, which cost him the bitter loss of the sight of the land of promise, was a relapse into this one sin of earlier days, when, vexed and weary with the provocation of a complaining people, 'he spake unadvisedly with his lips.' But this was the one only mote upon the otherwise bright shining of his steadfast grace. It is a remarkable fact, that as the leading Prophet of

the Old Covenant exhibited this power of transforming grace, as a pattern to those who should come after, so the chief Apostle of the New Covenant exhibited a similar instance, and in his case without any known fall to mar its perfectness. S. Peter was in early life signally marked by heedlessness. Never, perhaps, was there a man more rashly vaunting, or more impulsively self-reliant; and he fell through these faults. Yet if we may judge of his after-character by the tone and precepts which specially distinguish his writings, no one of the Apostles exhibited more prominently the graces of watchfulness, lowliness, and sobriety. These graces, as a general tone, pervade his Epistles, and are expressed in frequent injunctions.

"We may then regard it as a certain test, that in proportion as any marked fault of early life, any one cause of our many falls, becomes not only weakened, but replaced by its opposite,—in proportion as where we were weak, we are becoming strong, where we are, however slowly and inadequately, gaining on the defeated foe by the advancing steps of a triumphant Power from above,—the signs of a true conversion are manifest. The strong one is not only expelled from his fortress, it is being taken possession of by One stronger than he.

"The second test, also universally applicable, is the grace of humility. When the natural tendencies of self-assertion and self-glorying, the pride of life, are yielding to the growth of lowliness and simplicity, a true conversion is being worked. It is to be carefully noted, that the tendency to self-aggrandizement, the wish 'to be as gods,' was developed within the soul of man—how arising we know not—even before the state of supernatural righteousness, the Paradisaical condition of man's nature, was lost. Pride was a cause, not a consequence, of the Fall. It is, therefore, specially inherent and rooted in us; unlike other sins, such as lust and untruthfulness, which have grown out of the first sin, not stirred or at work previously to the Fall. The present hold which pride has upon our nature is connected with this fact. As it awoke before the first transgression, so it remains underlying all other impulses of evil, stimulating them, as if it were one's very self. On this account it may have been,—because our life, throughout all our race, has this fundamental evil at work within it,—that our LORD came in a state so marked by lowliness and self-sacrifice. It might seem to have been the one end of the manifestation of Himself—that in every aspect of His life He might teach this law, as a perpetual contradiction to man's primary and most characteristic sin. Scripture dwells upon it as though it were the one lesson which His sacrifice of Himself was intended to enforce. 'He died for all, that they which live should not henceforth live unto themselves, but unto Him Who died for them, and rose again.' He Himself selects it as the special distinguishing grace which was to be His true characteristic likeness. When He bids us copy Him, it is in this particular form of life; 'Learn of Me, for I am meek and lowly of heart.' We cannot, therefore, but regard this grace, as an essential, universal test of an amended life. Our life is amended just in proportion as we cease to assert self, to put self forward; as we grow in the attainment of the opposite state, self giving way, silently retiring, more and more being hidden even if possible from oneself; the spirit of unceasing sacrifice, which delights to be in itself

nothing, unobservedly offering all that one is, or can do, before the Sacred Presence in Which we ever move, the Beginning and Ending of our life."—P. 91—94.

We would suggest to Mr. Carter that the true parallel is between Moses and S. Paul (rather than S. Peter)—the discipline of the wilderness being applied to each. Moreover, a second failure is certainly recorded of S. Peter, (Gal. ii. 11.)

LEE AND BRADY ON THE IRISH SUCCESSION.

Some Strictures on Dr. Brady's Pamphlet, in which he denies the Descent of the Hierarchy of the present Church of Ireland from the Ancient Irish Church. A Letter to His Grace the Archbishop of Dublin, by WILLIAM LEE, D.D., Archdeacon of Dublin. Dublin: Hodges, Smith, and Co. 1866.

IN novels and plays we often meet with heroes who discover that they were changelings at their birth, and have no right to the property of which they are possessed, and we applaud their justice and generosity when they find out the real heir and restore him to his rightful position. Dr. Brady appears before the public as just such a hero of romance, the heroic part being omitted, for having discovered the real heir, he has as yet taken no steps to make restitution.

The title of the pamphlet which calls forth Dr. Lee's Answer will at once explain Dr. Brady's position. It is this,—“The Alleged Conversion of the Irish Bishops to the Reformed Religion at the Accession of Queen Elizabeth, and the Assumed Descent of the present established Hierarchy from the Ancient Irish Church disproved. By W. Maziere Brady, D.D., Vicar of Donoughpatrick, and Rector of Kilberry, Diocese of Meath. London: Longmans. 1866.” A Doctor of Divinity, and Incumbent of two benefices, proclaims the author not only to be a member of, but a clergyman who derives his income from that Church whose title-deeds he asserts to be nothing but a forgery and a lie. If they were so, or even if the Doctor thought so, the proclamation of the discovery, if followed by the resignation of his benefices, would be an act of justice much to be commended.

Another theory, however, is admissible—Dr. Brady may be under an hallucination. Such forms of insanity are not uncommon. We hear of persons fancying themselves entitled to the property of other persons, and conversely, although more rarely, we meet with persons who are deluded by a morbid fancy that they have no right to their own possessions. In the one case supposing Dr.

Brady to be honest and sane, he would have no other course than to resign his preferments, whilst in the other case, if he is labouring under some form of mental disease, we should exhort his friends to take care of him, and to treat the productions of his pen as the letters of insane men to great personages, which seldom reach their destination.

Yet not only does Dr. Brady remain Vicar of Donoughpatrick, and Rector of Kilberry, to which preferments, if he proves anything, he proves he has no right, but his pamphlet has reached a third edition without being suppressed by his friends. The eagerness of a certain portion of the public to seize on and believe anything that may be said to the prejudice of the Irish Church, rather than any weight belonging to Dr. Brady's statements, must have been the cause which has induced Dr. Lee to answer them. Dr. Lee felt himself challenged to do so by a quotation in Dr. Brady's pamphlet from a sermon preached by him at the consecration of the Archbishop of Dublin, in which he described that event as "an occasion on which the apostolic commission unfolded on these shores fourteen hundred years ago by the founder of the Irish Church was to be handed on in unbroken succession." This is designated by Dr. Brady as the most impudent falsehood in all history. Such an imputation it was unnecessary for one in Dr. Lee's position to answer, and that he has done so in temperate language, and with convincing arguments, is a most uncalled-for condescension; but at the same time we must welcome Dr. Lee's pamphlet as evidence of the strength of the position of the Irish Church which might never have been called to its support, but for the treacherous or insane attack of Dr. Brady.

"Two statements are advanced by Dr. Brady: 1. That whereas it is generally believed that only two of the Marian bishops were deprived of their sees by Elizabeth,—the other members of the Episcopate accepting the principles of the Reformation,—nevertheless in the words of Mr. Froude, 'with the exception of the Archbishop of Dublin (Hugh Curwin) not one of Queen Mary's bishops went over to the Reformation.' (P. 35.) 2. That Archbishop Curwin (who was consecrated at London House in 1555, by Bonner of London, Thirlby of Ely, and Griffin of Rochester) alone and without the assistance of any other bishop, consecrated the bishops through whom our present succession is derived, and that consequently 'the Irish succession remains with the Roman Catholic bishops of the Irish Church, while the bishops of the Anglican Church in Ireland whose orders are not derived from the ancient Irish Church, but from the English succession through Curwin, have the same Apostolical succession as the Established Church of England.' " (P. 41.)

These propositions are most convincingly refuted by Dr. Lee, although they bear on their face so strong an aspect of improbability that they scarcely need an answer. How comes it that the

discovery which Dr. Brady has exposed to view was never made before, when it would have been of inestimable value to the Roman cause in Ireland ?

The assertion that the Irish Bishops did not accept the Reformation on the accession of Elizabeth has already been disposed of by Mant. Having mentioned that Bishop Walsh of Meath, and Bishop Leverous of Kildare, refused to take the oath of supremacy, and were at once deposed, and having added that "these are the only two prelates who appear to have been deprived in the reign of Queen Elizabeth;" Bishop Mant goes on to notice the assertion of an anonymous writer, quoted by Strype (*Ecc. Ann.* 1, c. ii. p. 78) that an uncertain number of other bishops in addition to Archbishop Dowdal (who by-the-bye died before her accession) were deprived by Elizabeth, and then proceeds :

"There is neither record nor rational ground of suspicion of the deprivation of any others except the two whose deprivation is matter of historical notoriety. Had any others been deprived, the fact must have been known and recorded, and can hardly have escaped the notice of the ecclesiastical historians of the time. Indeed upon an inspection of the condition of the different sees about this time, it is evident that in about twenty no change of occupants occurred ; and whatever obscurity may attach to the occupancy of the remainder, being, as they are, those of least note and importance, there is not the faintest probability thence given to the hypothesis in any case that either of the bishops underwent deprivation."—*Mant's History of the Irish Church*, vol. i. p. 278.

Dr. Brady has, however, discovered that "twenty-one bishops upon evidence more or less conclusive are proved not to have conformed." Whether this evidence is "more or less conclusive" is the question examined by Dr. Lee. Queen Elizabeth's accession took place in 1558, and Walsh and Leverous, who refused to take the oath of supremacy, were then deprived. After this it appears that eight bishops were appointed from time to time commissioners by the Queen for certain civil and military as well as religious affairs. Of these Thonery, Bishop of Ossory, we are told, seems to have been deprived about the year 1561, and in 1571 the temporalities were taken from Lacy, Bishop of Limerick, and William Carey, a former bishop deprived in Mary's time, was restored by Queen Elizabeth. There is no evidence to show the cause of their deprivation, but it is reasonable to suppose that it was for the unfaithful discharge of the commission which they had accepted ; but so far from the deposition of these bishops proving Dr. Brady's theory, it is an evidence that they accepted the Queen's commissions, and that down to 1568 seven bishops at least were carrying them out.

Other evidence brought forward by Dr. Brady is equally inconclusive : for instance, Dr. Brady tells us that the Bishops of Elphin

and Kilfenora appear from the obituary notices by the Four Masters to have died in Roman Catholicism; but of the cogency of this argument it is easy to judge when we see what the Four Masters actually say. Of De Burgo it is said, "The loss of this good man was the cause of great lamentation in his own country," and of John O'Niallan of Kilfenora, who died in 1572, the obituary notice is simply that "he was a preacher of the word of God." It is inferred of others that they never conformed to the Reformation because the records speak of their deaths as of happy memory, (*bonæ memoriæ*.)

We have not space to follow Dr. Lee through his examination of Dr. Brady's arguments, and must therefore content ourselves with his conclusion.

"Such is literally the process of reasoning by which Dr. Brady fancies that twenty-one out of the twenty-six bishops who were in possession of Irish sees in 1558, are proved upon evidence more or less conclusive not to have conformed. One may easily admit that certain of these bishops played a double game; that some of them may have secretly endeavoured to keep on terms with the Pope, while they outwardly accepted the queen's supremacy: but to assert that their conformity went no further, and that they did not actually perform every official act which their position as bishops of the Reformed Church required, is as entirely opposed to Dr. Brady's own facts, as it is contradictory to the only conclusion which the course of events and the current historical information which we possess, allow to be drawn. The cases of Walsh and Leverous, of Lacy and Thonery clearly show what the results of non-conformity would have been. Hypocrites and dissemblers a few of them, perhaps, were; but except on the principles of Donatism, their private failings cannot be held to invalidate in any way their official acts, and no one can pretend to maintain that they were not competent to transmit the apostolical succession to the bishops whom they ordained. That they, as a matter of fact, did so, the absolute silence of all Roman Catholic writers down to Dr. Brady as to the existence of any defect in the transmission to us of the succession, is of itself a convincing proof."—P. 17.

The second proposition, that Apostolical Succession was transmitted to the Irish Episcopate by the hands of Archbishop Curwin alone without the assistance of any other bishop, next follows. The conclusion which Dr. Brady draws from this is, that as Curwin received consecration in England, the succession of the old Irish episcopate was not transmitted by him to the Elizabethan bishops. Dr. Brady does not appear to be aware that such a consecration by a single bishop would have been, to say the least, irregular. Dr. Lee has therefore taken the pains to show him the immemorial usage of the Church, that the assistance of three bishops at least should be deemed essential to a canonical and regular consecration, and then concludes,

"What I have here said on this subject may seem almost superfluous when we recollect that the rubric of the Anglican Ordinal according to which Curwin performed each act of consecration, expressly directs that the elected bishop shall be presented by two bishops unto the archbishop of that province, or to some other bishop appointed by lawful commission. And the preface to the same Ordinal further declares that 'no man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful bishop, priest, or deacon . . . or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto according to the form hereafter following, (in which the rubric just quoted occurs,) or hath had formerly episcopal consecration or ordination.'"—P. 23.

Dr. Brady says that "Not one of Queen Mary's prelates, except Hugh Curwin, can be proved to have had any part in the consecration of an Elizabethan bishop." But he forgets to mention that the records of the Irish Church, now extant, are so miserably meagre and defective, owing to the wars and confusion that prevailed, that no complete record of consecration is preserved either for the times preceding the Reformation, or for a considerable period subsequent to that event. Hence, the name of Curwin, and Curwin alone, appearing in the consecration records of the bishops whom Elizabeth appointed during the first eight years of her reign, proves nothing at all. Analogous records occur in ante-Reformation times, when one consecrator alone is mentioned, but yet we need not infer that the assistants were wanting, and the consecration consequently uncanonical. The *argumentum a silentio*, moreover, proves too much; for if the omission to name the bishops who assisted Curwin in the different consecrations in which he officiated is to be regarded as proof that none were present, what is to be the inference when, as happens in some cases, no consecrator is named at all?

When the record is complete, Dr. Lee notices that the canonical rule of the three consecrators is strictly observed, and why should we suppose that the law of the Church was set at nought on such very inconclusive evidence as that adduced by Dr. Brady?

Dr. Lee appends to his pamphlet a very learned appendix by Dr. L. Studdert, in which account is given of the consecrations during the first ten years of Elizabeth's reign, in which each case confutes Dr. Brady's conclusions. In each the Queen's letters require the consecration of the bishop in accordance to law, and not contrary to law, as would have been the case if Archbishop Curwin had performed the consecrations alone. So strange a fact as a consecration by one bishop alone must have attracted attention at the time, as not only would it have been contrary both to Act of Parliament and Canon Law, but it would have necessitated changes in the Consecration Service, since no assistant bishops would have been present.

But, after all, Dr. Brady's arguments are innocuous. He professes to prove at the outset that the Irish Succession remains with

the Roman Catholic bishops of the Irish Church; but before he concludes he is obliged to admit that "no documents of an official and formal character, such as extracts from a register, have, it is true, been produced to show that any one of those twenty-five prelates (the Marian bishops) laid hands in consecration upon any of their successors whom the Pope appointed." How then could the Irish Succession remain with the Roman Catholic bishops? He further admits that "No Irish consecration roll has been preserved, if *indeed* any such was in those troublous times regularly kept." What then becomes of his argument respecting the omission of the names of any bishops who assisted Curwin in the consecration of the Elizabethan bishops? From such an opponent as Dr. Brady the Irish Church has little indeed to fear.

A BENEDICTINE MONASTERY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY. (WESTMINSTER.)

By MACKENZIE E. C. WALCOTT, B.D., F.S.A., *Præcentor and Prebendary of Chichester Cathedral.*

THE following Customal was drawn up in 1266, for Abbot R. de Ware, of Westminster, by William de Haselye, Subprior and Master of the Novices. It is only the fourth part of the entire work, and a note adds that it was religiously kept by itself:—"a iij aliis partibus separata in conclavi ponitur quia secretiora nostri ordinis." The MS. was seriously injured in the Cotton fire, but has been admirably repaired under the supervision of Sir Frederick Madden, K.H. Mr. N. E. S. A. Hamilton first introduced it to my notice, and I read some extracts before the Royal Institute of British Architects a few years since. In the present summary I have used the excellent transcript made by Mr. Thompson, of the British Museum, which was kindly lent to me by the Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster. For purposes of illustration I have used the MS. Customal of Bury S. Edmund's, which, however, relates only to novices and junior monks. A fragment of the Customal of Rochester has been printed, and the whole of that of Abingdon, but no such graphic or complete picture of Benedictine life has ever yet been given to students or general readers as is presented in the volume from which the present extracts have been taken.

The *Claustales* et Personæ Domus were—

The Abbot,	}	these held chapter and collation, celebrated mass, and presided in hall.
The Major Prior,		
The Subprior,		
Custodes Ordinis, iiii. and iv. Priors,		

Præcentor.

Master of Novices. He might enter the parlour, and go with the novices to the regular parlour, infirmary, and tailory, for a bath or blood-letting, or to the forensic parlour, where he sat between novices and their visitors whilst in conversation. He had a deputy.

Succentor.

The Custodes might dine in the misericord, and take in guests with them.

The *Forensic*, not bound to attend choir always, were the—

Cellarer. He might go into London, but left his key with the prior. When the granarer acted in his absence, he was allowed to go into the infirmary or tailory.

Kitchener.

Chamberlain.

Infirmary.

Pitanciar.

External Hostillar. He might go into London.

Prior's Chaplain.

The *Quasi Claustrales*, bound to attend masses and hours, were the—

Sacristan. He might go into London.

Almoner. He might go to London or Paddington, and dine there in harvest time. The subalmoner might go into the forensic parlour, and talk with his servant and brief-carriers, or to the almonry to say mass or distribute alms. He furnished *virgas disciplinarias*.

Archdeacon, the vicar of the abbot in spirituals outside the monastery, might go into the town, or to the king's palace.

Gardener, might go into the parlour, but not beyond the precinct or to the palace without leave.

Custos of Lady Altar, held a court of tenants, and collected rents in the town by the prior's leave.

Intrinsic Hostillar, might go into the parlour, but not beyond the precinct or to the palace without leave.

Granarer, the coadjutor of the cellarer, might go to the bake-house and offices in the court, to the mill and the Thames, especially when corn was being landed, and like the subalmoner, sub-chamberlain, and subkitchener might go into the regular parlour.

Refectorer, might go into the parlour, but not beyond the precinct or into the palace. The subrefectorer might go into the cellarage to fetch wine for the prior.

Custos of High Altar and Reliquary, like the revestrar, succentor and subrefectorer and subsacrist, could not go into the parlour with leave.

Revestrar.

All appointed by the abbot.

Those who received food from the convent were—

Rector of Tothulle Chapel.

Hereditary servant of the Revestry.

The Abbey Porter. At the kitchen window.

The Butler. Ditto.

The Forensic Bedell. Ditto.

The principal servant of the Tailory. Ditto.

Braciator, (brewer.)

The Baker of the Convent.

The Farmer in the Granary.

The Garden servants.

The Hortolan (under-gardener) of the cellarer's garden, who furnished potherbs to the pottage-maker on flesh meat days in the misericord.

The Plumber.

The Master Cook, in the kitchen.

The Kitchen ostiarius.

The Pottage seether.

Manciple.

The Pelliner, (preparer of parchments.)

The Chamberlain's servant, in charge of the cressets.

Allutarius, (a tanner. Castell's Lexicon, s. v.)

Servant of Infirmary.

Servant of Parlour.

The Hortolani (under-gardeners) of the Cellarer.

The following had wine—

The Abbey Porter.

The Servant of the vestibule.

The Servant of the chamber.

The Physician.

The Priest of Tothill.

The Goldsmith.

The Chanter's writer.

The Baker.

The Conventual Butler.

1. THE ABBOT coming with bare feet to the cemetery gate, was there received by the convent, and kissed the Gospels; the chanter began "Ecce virum prudentem," or "Sint lumbi." A station in the nave was made before the cross. He was then led by bishops or abbots as far as his stall at the west end of the choir, where he prostrated himself until the responsal was sung, and then he was lifted up by a bishop or abbot, who installed him, saying, "Sta in justitia." The Te Deum was sung, and all the brethren kissed him in turn, bending the knee before and after. After receiving the benediction, he visited the little altars and the shrine, the service concluding with "Salvum fac." In the first chapter the obedientiaries laid their keys before him on the step. If passing

through cloister or places where the brethren were sitting, all rose and bowed humbly. He never supped in hall; when he left his table at the *potum caritatis*, all stood on the step before their tables, and bowed. The prior and the two servitor monks at the *skylla* gave water before dinner to him, and the prior and two kitchen servitors did so after hall. He was buried in a cope, with a schedule of absolution and *cruce de candelis facta* on his breast.

2. THE PROVOST OR MAJOR PRIOR had the first place in choir on the north side, was a priest, and took his turn in saying mass. In hall and at matins his chaplain supplied his absences. After Matins he visited the infirmary, and after the xv. gradual psalms and compline, refection and supper, all the monastic chambers and places frequented by the brethren, except the guest-house of stranger monks. At night, with a lantern, he made the round of the whole monastery including the dormitory and *sedilia latrinæ*. He was to see that the obedientiaries corrected their servants, except those appointed by the abbot and convent. He gave the *sonitum* in the dormitory, and after the meridian beat the sign with three blows. If bled, he slept out of the dormitory, stood *extra chorum*, and did not dine in hall. He supplied the abbot's place in the refectory. He made signals to the church servants by clapping his hands. When going his rounds, he in passing the chapter-house door, paused, and bowed to the east, and all in chapter rose and bowed. In all processions to the dormitory he went last, and stopped at the door. If he went into London he informed the subprior of his intended absence. On common days he rang the *skylla* for chapter, but on festivals one of the lesser bells was rung. He slept in the dormitory. He was allowed 20s. by the convent for his two servants. On the First Sunday in Advent and on Septuagesima he entertained all the obedientiaries and seniors in his chamber.

3. THE SUBPRIOR OR PRIOR OF CLOISTER, in the absence of the prior, had charge of the cloisters, and could license the sick to go into the infirmary, and eat flesh; could allow absence from cloister, and visited the infirmary and misericord. He sat in choir on the abbot's side. Like the other *exploratores claustris*, he was not to miss any service if possible, and as the other *custodes ordinis*, might go to the *recluserium fratris nostri*, walk along the Thames' bank, and enter the king's palace, but might not go to London or through the abbey gate facing the town without notice to the prior.

4. 5. THE THIRD and FOURTH PRIORS were called the Rounds, *Circas*, or *Circuitores monasterii*, as their duty was to visit the whole monastery (except the prior's and cellarer's chambers) in the middle of the second nocturn; during the last lesson in Offices of the Dead, in winter; at lauds after the psalm "*Laudate Dominum*;" after low and high mass, and the end of Vigils of the Dead; and at dinner or supper time, if they suspected anything to be amiss. The third prior in choir sat on the abbot's side, and the fourth prior on the prior's side.

6. **THE PRÆCENTOR** was a priest, and the abbot's vicar in choir, as the custodes represented him in cloister; and occupied high rank, sitting on the abbot's side in choir. He was called Armarius, as keeper of the books and aumbries, and had the oversight of the reading and singing. He was never to ask *venia* in chapter for absence from choir, though he was bound to attend matins and vespers, or compline. He drew up the table of festivals and antiphons. He was to set a good example by shaving, and washing his feet on Saturdays in cloister. He held the choir with seven *socii* on great feasts, and with four on lesser festivals. In processions his place was between the two choirs, to see that all sang and walked becomingly. He arranged the various assistants at mass, and intoned the psalms and antiphons. He selected sixteen of the younger brethren to chant the invitatory on great festivals, and the responsals at both their vespers. He distributed the best copes on such days to the elder monks, and those who were to attend him at tierce; the copes being laid out on forms in choir by the sacristan, on the top of the worse: the latter he gave out to the monks by seniority. He furnished incense books and parchment; read out briefs and letters in chapter, composed and corrected the correspondence of the chapter and sealed it; as he had one of the three keys of the common seal. Until the writer's house was built he was allowed to go only to the tailory to make incense; but afterwards was allowed to go out of cloister into the forensic parlour, and anywhither within the precinct.

7. **THE SUCCENTOR** sat on the prior's side in choir, and in the præcentor's absence had his powers and rank. He assisted the præcentor in giving out copes; he intoned the psalms and antiphons. On the prior's side, kept the music books of the choir, wrote out the table on feasts of three or twelve lections, regulated the censuring, and woke the brethren at vigils of the dead. Like other subalternaries acting in their superior's office, he asked leave from choir or cloister of the prior.

8. **THE SACRISTAN**, called the *secretarius* and *horoscopus*, quasi *horis incumbens*, seeing bells were rung for the hours, consecrated the incense, and found for all altars but the Lady altar and infirmary high altar, all books and necessities for Divine Service, and supplied or repaired the books at the requisition of the præcentor. He provided mats for benches in the chapter-house, sounding-tablets and mallets, basins and towels for the Saturday maundy or foot-washing, wax for the tablets on which the order of feasts was written in the chapter-house, the bell of the maundy in the parlour, and the bell for waking the brethren in the dormitory (the chamberlain finding the rope;) the cymbal in cloister and the skylla over the refectory table; the roofing of the church, chapter-house, and cloister, as far as the dormitory door, and handwarmers of iron, or *luceas* with burning charcoal, in winter, for the mass-priests; tapers at the burial of a monk; mats yearly before the

altars and on the steps and benches ; on all principal feasts rushes and hay in the presbytery, and wherever there was no pavement, and rushes and ivy leaves for the choir on vigils of the Ascension, Pentecost, and Trinity Sunday. He had one cartload of hay yearly from the abbot's mead, and another from the hostillar's meadow. He provided graves, and the keeper of the Lady chapel a coffin, (sarcophagus,) for monks or seculars dying in the house. He was not to talk in church with any monk or any lay person, (except to point out a relie or some noticeable object,) unless it were a king, queen, bishop, abbot, or high nobleman. He had charge of the treasury, church, ornaments, plate, and lights. He issued tapers and candles for the refectory, abbot's, prior's, and cellarer's chambers, the infirmary, guest-house, brethren on journey, and the sub-chamberlain. Four times in the year at least he made the oblates or hosts, he and his assistants being in albs with amices on their heads, whilst the hours, penitential psalms, and litany were sung. He found *canestella cum brachinella vini* and claret, with two good pittances and one medium *ferculum*, and a *modon ad caritatem*, on the feasts of SS. Peter and Paul and S. Peter ad vincula ; and wine and a good pittance on the Exaltation of the Holy Cross and Octave of S. Agnes, and on the Invention of the Holy Cross beer: the allowance was a half-pint (dim. sextarium) to each monk.

9. THE SUBSACRISTS.—The sacristan had four subsacrists : one his colleague ; a second in charge of the high altar and relics, who apparelled the high altar for high mass ; a third the revestrar, who had charge of S. Faith's chapel, the vestments and ornaments of the altars, and cleansed them ; and a fourth assistant. The revestrar, with a helper, kept account of the payments to the kitchen, and was thence called the treasurer popularly, and, like the keeper of relics and the other obedientiaries, was appointed by the abbot. The chief subsacrist was the sacristan's representative, and had charge of the oblates, wine, incense, oil, wax, charcoal, and candles. He rose first of any at the sound of the clock, woke the servants, provided candles at nocturns for the novices, and the lantern which was carried through the choir at matins to detect sleepers. He carried the books and necessities to and from the vestry. Every Sunday he received salt from the kitchen, and after its benediction gave it to the refectorer, who put it in the saltcellars in hall. He extinguished the lights used at collation in the chapter-house, and carried them back into the church, unless there was a *potus caritatis* on certain days in hall, when he accompanied the convent, and one of the four church servants did this duty. One of the lesser bells was rung for collation, and for chapter on eves and feasts ; in summer after the meridian, and for nones until the end of the hymn ; and one of the great bells after compline. Four servants of the church were the belhringers, and at certain hours

the brethren of the guild. The four subsacristis slept in church, taking their watch and the care of the clock in turn, so that the bells might be rung in time.

10. 11. CELLARERS, FORENSIC AND INTERNAL.—The forensic cellarer had charge of all manors and possessions of the convent, saw that proper provosts and servants had charge of farm labour, and that there was an annual audit of rents, and that there was never wanting a due supply of cheese, meal, barley, oats, and wood in the house. When at home he kept the cellar-key, and the interior cellarer stayed in the cloister. He told the prior whither he was going on progress, and was to act with the advice of the convent; he was tabled for masses, and was required to attend matins.

The internal cellarer had the key of the cellarage and granary; he issued bread and beer, and had charge of all the vessels and furniture of the cellarage, offices, mill, mead, and portariæ. The granarer was his "right hand" and aid. He had charge of the roofs of the cellarage and refectory, and the cloister adjoining. He had the appointment of the servants of the offices. Two and a half quarters of grain (worth 12s. 6d.) daily for bread, and sixty-eight quarters of barley (at 3s. the quarter,) and oats (at 2s. the quarter) every fortnight for ale; three quarters of barley and six of oats at each brewing, were given out by the cellarer.

12. THE KITCHENER.

13. THE PITANCIAR found pittances on great festivals from proceeds of Okham church and Bemflete manor. These included wine, beer, mead, ris (rice,) tailliz (hash of crevisse, &c.,) oysters, hissellum, morterels (meat brayed in a mortar,) eels in bruetto (broth,) placentæ (plaice,) salt eels of Grantebrigge, murenuls (conger eels,) lamprills, merlings (merlucies, small cod,) haddock, gurnard, sea breme, great welkes, conchiliæ (winkles,) allec (fish-sauce,) Flanders west, or east called Dabhen, and crannoeh (pottage.)

The boat for bringing fish from London was maintained by the Kitchener and Pitanciar.

The measures of wine were gallons and flacons and sextaries.

(To be continued.)

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

The Divine Liturgy of S. John Chrysostom, done into English: with prefatory Notes, and the original Greek of the open parts. Masters.

THIS little book, the translator tells us, is intended "merely as a practical manual for travellers and others who may wish to assist at the Liturgy of the Eastern Church." As such it will be very valuable to

Englishmen visiting the East, because it will enable them to follow the Office, except on some few special days, in all the great divisions of the orthodox community. But besides this limited use, it will be of great service to English churchmen generally. Many persons find a difficulty in forming a clear idea of a Roman Mass, although the Roman Church is existing in the midst of us. How much more difficult then to realize the Holy Office as said at Constantinople or Jerusalem. To all such we especially commend this most convenient and elegant volume, which has been prepared by a loving and skilful hand. The few prefatory notes give all the information that is needed for understanding the several functions in the rite, and the translation is so good, and at the same time faithful, that it may be read with facility.

Doctrinally too, of course, it puts the reader in possession of the teaching of the Great Eastern Communion on some of the most critical subjects. Thus, for example, she is wont to commend the faithful departed, "We offer to Thee this rational act of adoration for those that are deceased in the faith, Patriarchs, Prophets, . . . especially our Lady," &c. &c. So also at the end of the Liturgy the intercession of the Saints is recognised, but without invocation; the priest blessing the faithful in this manner: "CHRIST our true GOD by the intercession of our Lady, by the might of the life-giving Cross, of the Angels, the Baptist, the Apostles, Basil the Great, . . . through the prayers of our holy Fathers, O LORD JESUS CHRIST, GOD, have mercy upon us and save us."

The larger half of the volume is taken up with the Epistles and Gospels in Greek and English.

This, together with the Bishop of Brechin's Translation of the Scotch Office into Greek, we may trust will lead to something of a better mutual understanding between ourselves and our brethren in the East, which may God in His good time hasten.

1. *The Psalter and Canticles Pointed for Chanting, as used by the Church Union Society for the Archdeaconry of Sudbury.* London: Spottiswoode and Co.

2. *The Advertisement to the same.*

To all who use Anglican chants we strongly recommend this Psalter, which is really arranged on Gregorian principles—first, in excluding barred time; secondly, in following the syllabic system; and thirdly, when the syllabic method is departed from, in putting two notes to one syllable rather than running two or three syllables, as is commonly done in Anglican chanting, to one note. The Sudbury Church Music Society seems to have tried the system of this Psalter, and according to the Author's account, with very great success.

The Preface also contains some very just remarks on the distinction between the use of music as a "vehicle of expression," (which is its proper use in chanting,) and as "a medium of impression," (which is the proper scope for the anthem and the voluntary.) While the editor entertains these views, we cannot understand how he can be content with Anglican chants at all.

A Chronological Synopsis of the Four Gospels, designed to show that on a minute critical analysis the writings of the Four Evangelists contain no contradiction within themselves. By H. GRENVILLE. London: J. Russell Smith.

THIS harmony differs from most others in not giving the actual words of the Evangelists, but simply indicating the facts or conversations recorded by their titles, as, e.g., "JESUS teaches from Simon's boat," "Some Scribes and Pharisees seek for a sign." The work has been a labour of love to its author, he tells us, for forty years, and may be consulted with advantage.

More than half of the little volume consists of "Notes on the Synopsis," which are just what might be expected from a man who relies entirely on his own ideas, and sets at nought all authority. Occasionally we meet with an interesting discussion on such a matter as chronology, but more often the results are ridiculous, and not unfrequently painful. Thus Mr. Grenville argues that Lebbæus is the same as Levi; ἀναλήψεως in S. Luke ix. 51, he translates "being received favourably," instead of "being taken up;" and in S. Matth. xxvii. 5, Judas Iscariot is said to have "had a strangulation, i.e. a strangulated hernia;" and then to fit in with this marvellous translation "the girdle wherewith he was girded," in Ps. cix. 19, is actually turned by Mr. Grenville into a "truss!"

The Acts of the Deacons; being a Course of Lectures, Critical and Practical, on Acts vi. vii. viii. and xxi. 8—15. By EDWARD MEYRICK GOULBURN, D.D. London: Rivingtons.

WE need not tell our readers that Dr. Goulburn writes nicely, and that his theology is in advance of what prevails at Islington and in the Borough. But we must confess that the predominant feeling with which we rise from the perusal of these lectures is that of compassion for popular preachers like the writer before us, who has the misfortune to be dependent on a pew-renting congregation. Under no other circumstances could such a volume as this appear. An historical subject in itself seems to give some hope of emancipation from the usual trammels under which a west end clergyman ordinarily preaches. But in point of fact the Acts of the Apostles is most dangerous ground; the Church throughout the book is such a living energetic body that it will not be hid—and voluntary congregations of the old stamp do not like to hear of any authority above themselves. Consequently the preacher is obliged perpetually to apologize for S. Luke, and to insert reflections which it really makes one blush to read—so very transparent is the motive that dictates them. Of such a character are (1) what is said about the institution of the Diaconate, as though it did not form part of the divinely intended platform of the Church, but was just the people's will; (2) the misapplication of the example of the Bereans whom S. Luke praises for the very opposite virtue to that commended by Dr. Goulburn, viz. their willingness to take things on trust; (3) the calling Justification "the highest of all God's gifts;" and (4) the citing of the Baptism of the Eunuch as an instance of the *free* working of the

Church in the Apostolic times. We cannot of course suppose that Dr. Goulburn writes what he does not believe to be true. Rather we believe his case to be that of multitudes of other clergy who have so accustomed themselves to consult the prejudices of their congregations, that they reverse the precept given in the Prophet Malachi and unconsciously receive the law instead of giving it.

Memoranda of Angelical Doctrine from Lady Day to the Ascension: digested and done into English by a Scottish Priest, (Brown, Aberdeen; Parker, Oxford,) are condensed from two chapters of the *Summa* of S. Thomas. We hope that many sermons will be quarried from them, as well as from Mr. Ashley's Dominical Sermons of the same great doctor, of which the second part has just been published by the Church Press Company.

It is to the same Scottish Priest, we presume, that we are indebted for a thoughtful *Essay on Sacrifice*, (Hayes,) as well as for a sermon preached at Aberdeen on the Festival of the English Church Union. We are sorry to notice in the latter the continued existence of internal dissension among Scotch Churchmen.

The Rev. W. HOUGHTON has published, in a separate and slightly enlarged form, the very able *Essay on Pauline Theology* (Masters) which appeared originally in our pages. Its circulation, we believe, is calculated to produce great good. The teaching of S. Paul is thoroughly misunderstood by all Low Churchmen—a remark which we might extend to all the Epistles as well as to the Acts of the Apostles. On the other side, it will be remembered that the author freely acknowledges not uncommon “defectiveness of Anglo-Catholic teaching” as respects spirituality. The *Essay*, therefore, cannot be called one-sided.

The Rev. S. SMITH has taken advantage of a tour in the Holy Land to attempt to give somewhat of a graphic character to a series of historical lectures on sacrifice. The book is called the *Altar and the Cross*. (Longmans, London.) It has no theological pretensions, although necessarily touching on some of the chief doctrines of the faith. Mr. Smith tells us, in the preface, that his hearers were interested at the delivery of the sermons; but the reader is scarcely in the same position as those who were favourably disposed towards him by previous acquaintance.

An Ordination Sermon by Mr. LIDDON, *Fatalism and the Living God*, (Rivingtons,) needs only to be announced.

NOTICE TO CORRESPONDENTS.

THE Editor regrets that owing to illness, combined with another accidental cause, the last number was published in an incomplete state, and that the concluding article received no revision.

OXFORD: ITS MORALS AND ITS POLITICS.

1. *Letter to the Rev. C. W. Sandford.* By GOLDWIN SMITH, M.A.
2. *Letter to Mr. G. Smith.* By the Rev. P. G. MEDD, M.A.
3. *The Daily News.*
4. *The Saturday Review.*

OXFORD has received of late even more than its usual share of public notice. From the days that the *Times* denounced the late Dr. Buckland as a Tractarian the newspapers have delighted to write about the elder University; but it is only lately that the better informed among them have repeated these kinds of blunders. The *Saturday Review* was supposed to receive many of its articles directly or indirectly from Oxford; and the "Theology" of the *Times* has been said for the last few years to take its colour from one who very recently ceased to be a Professor there. Do these recent blunders indicate that those who considered themselves leaders of thought on the banks of the Isis have already ceased to be in harmony with the intellect of the place? If not, we do not know how to account for the nonsense which these two papers have recently talked about Oxford.

The letter of another ex-Professor which we have placed at the head of this article, and which is written to advocate new constitutional changes in its Government, strikingly confirms this view, and implies that, as things now stand, Mr. Goldwin Smith despairs of the Republic.

For the last few years the great fear of parents sending sons to Oxford has been lest they should be corrupted by the sceptical theories represented by "Essays and Reviews." The danger indeed has been loudly vaunted by the party itself, who have been continually declaring that they had a monopoly of all the talent in the University. And no doubt there is a real power in this habit of self-assertion, especially with the young; if they hear it said perpetually that a thing is, they rarely have the courage to inquire if it really be as it is said.

So things have gone on in Oxford for the last sixteen years; that is, since Parliament effected the recent change in her Constitution which displaced the authority of the heads of houses, and made professors and tutors two of the estates of the academical realm. For a time the "liberal" element prevailed so entirely as to carry all the elections, and the new Constitution was pronounced by the liberals to be working admirably. By degrees that ascendancy has been lost. The elections at the latter part of last year went against the liberals; but they consoled themselves that they would gain by the new registration of residence, which comes

into operation immediately after the long vacation. However, it has turned out otherwise. They find that they have gained nothing. The tide has not so thoroughly turned but that a large proportion of young tutors still begin life as liberals; but, as a matter of fact, since the Dean of Westminster left Oxford there has not been any one to make liberalism popular. Several of the leading members of that party are notoriously not attractive men, and they are gradually becoming shelved without any persons of conspicuous talent from among the young rising up to take their place. Of course we do not mean that Dr. Stanley possessed any of the great marks of genius, much less that he has any solid learning. But he was good-natured and could talk, wrote pleasant sermons and lectures, and gave dinners and breakfast parties. So he kept a party together. Now on the other hand, when this factitious advantage has been lost to the liberals; and further, since Government no longer holds out its baits to aspiring intellect, dismay appears to have broken out in the camp. Accordingly the *Times* and the *Saturday Review* forgetting their ancient feud have entered on a friendly rivalry—to see which can say the most foolish thing on the question, and Mr. Goldwin Smith and his *alter idem*, the *Daily News*, throwing aside the philosophic toleration which they usually professed, are equally loud in denouncing the terrible fact that young Oxford is beginning to think for itself, and has presumed to cast off the leading-strings in which certain professors and ex-professors have for some time held it.

For ourselves we have never professed to advocate any particular party in politics, and therefore we are the more intitled to protest against the efforts that are thus made to fix the stamp of liberalism on the undergraduate mind. This is really the meaning of the doleful plaint put forth by Messrs. Smith and Co., that they are losing the rising generation in the University. The divisions at the "Union" seem to indicate that this is the case, and though we do not attach very much weight to premature formations of opinion by young men, and believe that many who in times past have been reputed as advanced liberals will settle down into men of sound sober judgment; yet we cannot see what right, on their own principle, Mr. Smith and his friends have to complain if undergraduates turn out to be conservatives and Churchmen.

But, perhaps, the sting lies in what they denounce as "Propagandism." A word in respect to this charge both as regards politics and religion. 1. Now surely the charge against any one of availing himself of a position assigned to him in the University for educational purposes in order to imbue the minds of the young with political theories or the connections of party sits rather badly on Mr. Goldwin Smith, who, during the whole time of his professoriate, has been writing articles in the *Daily News* of a very decided bias, and has not scrupled to join the "Liberation Society,"

whose avowed object it is to effect the separation of Church and State. In the same way, if our memory does not fail us, in the Inaugural Lecture which he published, there was a strong denunciation of the Catholic movement in theology, of which Oxford has happily been the scene. Again; no one can have resided in Oxford during the last fifteen years without meeting Mr. Jowett perpetually walking with single undergraduates. He never fails, we imagine, wind and weather permitting, to "take out" an undergraduate as the companion of his daily walk. It would be difficult to find more decided "propagandism" than this. And we do not know if it be in despair of gaining sufficient audiences of young *men* that some of the more advanced liberals of the University have lately commenced lectures on History and Philosophy for *ladies*. But undoubtedly the great author of Propagandism in Oxford was Dr. Stanley, who, besides walks and breakfast parties, commenced the system of expository lectures on the New Testament on Sunday evenings to volunteer classes of young men, and who, with questionable fairness, when he was appointed Professor of Ecclesiastical History, began what was really a critical course on the Old Testament.

Now, however, Mr. Smith tells us (and we have no reason to question the accuracy of his information,) liberalism has done its worst, and the expedients before referred to have failed, or rather men of his own party have failed who could carry them out; and in some instances there have arisen from the opposite school more able and attractive men, who, borrowing a leaf out of their books, use these instruments against Mr. Smith and his friends. *Hinc illæ lacrymæ*.

And here it may not be out of place to chronicle another liberal collapse. A few years since when the Oxford Architectural Society had well nigh run its course by the general acceptance by the profession of the views which it had advocated, advantage was taken of its feebleness to foist History into its title along with Architecture; and in due time Mr. Goldwin Smith was made its president. He has never, however, been able to stimulate the society into life, and now, if not dead, it is at least moribund.

But before quitting the subject of politics, we will quote a passage from a very just rejoinder which has been made to Mr. Smith's letter by Mr. Medd:—

"You have yourself, more than any other resident among us, taken care to prevent its being a secret that among the cherished designs of the so-called 'Liberal' party are included measures which many who would absolutely refuse to be classed as mere dull reactionaries, cannot but regard as revolutionary and destructive, and that on points of fundamental principle.

"You have argued elaborately in favour of the total abolition of reli-

gious tests, and of subscription as a condition of the Convocation franchise and of holding office, even such an office as that of a theological professor within the University. You would doubtless accept to the full the scheme of University 'Reform' sketched out in such unmistakable terms the other day by Mr. Grant Duff, in his speech to his constituents.

"I feel it a duty to do what I can to prevent the realization of this design.

"I can acquiesce with entire satisfaction in the discontinuance of the requirement of subscription to the Articles by Undergraduates and Bachelors, and rejoice in the admission to the highest education we can offer of all who like to avail themselves of it. I should be very willing to see fellowships, terminable or otherwise, founded by Nonconformists (as all our existing endowments have been given us by Churchmen) and attached either to a Nonconformist Collegiate Foundation, or to the University in some such manner as the University Scholarships now are, for the benefit of those who are not admissible to the existing Fellowships. But I am not prepared for the destruction of the distinctly Christian and Church character which up to this moment has been secured to the University as a collective institution, and to its several collegiate foundations by the requirement that the members of their governing bodies should belong to the Church of England.

"That subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles is the best mode of carrying out that requirement I am not so sure, and of course the exaction of it, or of any test, from those who are already in holy orders, is as unnecessary as it is to make laymen promise that in 'public prayer and administration of the Sacraments, they will use the form in the Prayer Book prescribed and no other.' I should myself be inclined to prefer a simple signature to the Nicene Creed and to a declaration of membership in the Church of England.

"Whilst I am hopeful enough of the cause to which I have devoted my life to believe that the Church would hold her own in the University even after the abolition of tests, I am convinced that the large majority of the more earnest religious dissenters themselves would prefer that guarantee of a Christian profession which is furnished by the retention of the management of the University and colleges in the hands of members of the Church of England, to the open proclamation of religious indifferentism.

"All must admit that the change in principle would be considerable, so considerable, and I venture to think, so undesirable, that for my own part, so long as I know that it is the ceaseless endeavour of those who call themselves 'Liberals' to effect it, and, as a step to parliamentary interference, to secure the expression of an opinion in favour of it by a majority in council or in congregation, I must feel myself constrained in elections to the former body, to vote for those, whom, however I might prefer others on general academical grounds, I can trust to take the Conservative side on this cardinal question."

In illustration of Mr. Medd's remark it may be mentioned that one Professor of Mr. Smith's school (the Professor of Political Economy) is chairman of the (Political) Reform League in Oxford,

and that Mr. Smith himself was advertised a short time since to lecture to the League.

2. And now to speak briefly on the charge of Religious Propagandism, which has been more especially spoken of in the *Daily News*, and which Mr. Smith proposes to meet by disfranchising all, or nearly all residents, who have the cure of souls. The parochial clergy in fact are accused by Mr. Smith of two misdemeanours. First, they disagree with him both in politics and religion. Therefore he says they must have no vote in Congregation—and Convocation in his new Reform Bill is to have no power at all. And secondly, young men will go and listen to them, instead of taking their theology from the Professor of Greek or Dr. Colenso.

Now this is really only part of the general indictment before referred to. Time was when from several of the city pulpits might be heard doctrine more or less in harmony with the sentiments of our ex-professors, and Dr. Stanley himself used often to occupy the most important of them. If it is not so now, then we have but another illustration of the change that has been gradually coming over the University. Most of these churches are in the patronage of one or other of the Colleges and are held by Fellows or ex-Fellows. Of the two which are held by Cambridge men, the one is the Simeonite living of S. Aldate; the other may be said to represent a negative liberalism, which is by no means attractive. The influence of the pulpit in Oxford is mainly a question of intellect; and as almost all the great preachers of the day are now High Churchmen, so it has come to pass in Oxford that the best preaching is found to be in connection with the churches where doctrine and ritual are the highest. In matter of preaching, the day has been fairly won, and Mr. Smith ought in all fairness to allow it. The Broad Church party cannot be said to possess any one preacher of eminence; and it was only the other day that we saw a lament in an Evangelical periodical that they had only one great preacher remaining to them, and he is an Irishman, and already in the decline of life.

Let no one fear, however, that this is some extreme development of external religion which is in fashion. There never was a grosser hoax practised upon any one than the article inserted in the *Saturday Review* describing Undergraduates walking about the streets in ecclesiastical "head-dresses," and other vestments of a peculiar kind. The Churchmanship of the Oxford Churches, it is well known, is of a very sober type, and no encouragement to extravagance is held out, we believe, by any of the parochial clergy in or near the city. It is not in Oxford, as in London, that some one or two churches have gone ahead; the movement has been general, reaching to the cathedral and the college chapels—so that it may truly be said that no one in Oxford has done more for ritual, in its best sense, than Dr. Liddell, the present Dean of Christ Church,

who has caused the seats in the cathedral to be placed in the right position, has caused the service to be intoned which was formerly "read," and has established weekly Communion. In this way, and by the improvement of college chapels and services ritual has happily been taken out of the hands of party, and its observance has become *un fait accompli*. This Mr. Goldwin Smith observes with regret.

And now let us turn to the question of morality. Along with liberalism in doctrine latterly there has prevailed muscularity in amusement. This began with the Volunteer Rifle movement, and the purchase of cricket-grounds by the university, and has now extended to college racket-courts and athletic sports, which are so entirely recognised by the authorities, that the notices of the games are put up officially at the college gates; tutors accept the offices of stewards and umpires, and Heads and their wives frequent the course.

These innovations, it is superfluous to say, were all advocated on the plea that the recognition of certain amusements would cause other more questionable ones to be given up, and would create habits of manly self-control. At the recent York Congress this expected result was boldly challenged by a layman, resident in Oxford, a lecturer of some years' standing, who himself belongs, we believe, to the liberal school. In his paper on preaching, Mr. Sidney Owen, after finding great fault with modern sermons, went on to trace the evil to its source, and was bold enough to lay the blame chiefly at the door of the general dissipation of mind which he found to prevail among the young men, owing to the exaggerated place which has been given in schools and in the universities to amusements of different kinds.

We were ourselves much struck by the remark, and have been at some pains to ascertain what grounds there may be to justify the charge of increased frivolity.

The inquiry evidently is a very delicate one. But, passing over points which may be called simply external, such as laxity in costume and the general prevalence of slang terms in conversation, the universality of smoking, and the sanctioning of balls and theatricals at commemorations, we have ascertained some facts which are undeniable. First, it appears that billiards, which was to have been driven out by rifle practice, has enormously increased, so that there are now many more tables than there were in Oxford, and that there is an annual match played between Oxford and Cambridge. Secondly, the number of bad women is very much greater than formerly, and the proctors have quite given up attempting to keep the streets clear of them, or to send them to gaol when found. Other vices and extravagances are also said to be very much in the ascendant; but we prefer confining ourselves to the two statements made above, which are capable of demonstration.

The Bishop of Oxford, with his usual gallantry, said a word at York in behalf of undergraduate morality; but it was chiefly with the view of recommending diocesan colleges, whose apology of course it really is that the Universities, as now administered, do not fit men for the ministry of the Church. And this view, by the way, is unconsciously advocated by "S. G. O." and the *Times*, who urge, that if the priesthood possesses any sacramental gifts—and the *Times* admits that the *words* of the Prayer Book affirm that it does—then a person who seeks it ought to have a special preparation beyond that of the Universities.

But this by the way. We call attention to the evidence of Mr. Owen, simply in order to show that recent changes in the discipline of Oxford have not improved morality; as all competent judges affirm that scholarship has sadly deteriorated under the system introduced into our public schools by Dr. Arnold and his disciples.

As respects politics, Mr. Smith's letter is the best evidence that the tide is beginning to turn. A general effort is about to be made to improve the teaching of schools. Mr. Owen, in his paper at York, so far as we know, was the first to call in question the morality of the University at the present time, as compared with what existed in past days. We trust that this latter subject will also be taken up and sifted. To ourselves it would seem strange if there were not a corruption of morals growing up, seeing that there has been a great tendency of late to substitute the system of lecturers for tutors; and that the tutors, many of whom are laymen, are certainly much more lax in their habits, particularly as regards College Chapel and University sermons, than they were formerly; and that habits of self-indulgence have enormously increased among them. We do not deny that many of these lay fellows and tutors are personally men of pure minds; but if education is what the Church has ever believed it to be, there must be something more than mere negative morality in those that teach.

A new form of amusement has also received a recognition, we are informed, this term, viz., a public theatre, in which Undergraduates are both actors and spectators. In making these remarks on the morals of Oxford, we are far from insinuating that there exists anything like general corruption. Undoubtedly a large section of the Undergraduate body is altogether exemplary in morals. Many we believe to be moral on the highest religious grounds; and not a few on grounds merely secular. These, however, form the exception; the mass of men will just be what the University makes them. It is not, therefore, in human nature but that when discipline is allowed to grow lax, and amusements receive so large a share of consideration from the authorities, the mass of men must become more or less frivolous. This is what Mr. Owen affirms to be a fact.

We must not conclude without making a few observations on Mr. Smith's new Reform Bill for the University.

1. It begins with an ideal vice-chancellor, who is to be a man of "large mind"—apparently a kind of minister of public instruction; who, however, unlike ordinary ministers of state, is not to be "hampered with details of business:" a Mr. Gladstone, we suppose, without the necessity of excogitating a budget; or a professor or ex-professor, who is not obliged to give lectures!

2. He would do away with the need of residence in qualification for voting in congregation; and would allow all ex-tutors and ex-professors to have votes. Perhaps, after all, however, he might find this a more unmanageable body than he supposes.

3. Mr. Smith would disfranchise those who, he thinks, most disagree with him—notably the parish clergy. With regard to this plan, we would advise Mr. Smith to recommend it to Mr. Bright: the disfranchising your opponents seems really to be a simpler process than that of enfranchising your friends. All that Mr. Smith seems to need just now in Oxford is to get some twenty persons out of his way; and on this same principle Mr. Bright, we doubt not, would very easily be able to make all counties and boroughs return such members as he could wish.

A last word as to professors. It always seemed to us the great mistake of Mr. Gladstone's Bill, the lifting these gentlemen into a separate estate; and all subsequent experience seems to confirm that apprehension. We admit that it is well that the University should be able to retain men of eminence in their several departments; but as regards ordinary education they will not be able to maintain a high position. Even now, when they are young and fresh in their work, they are unable to get audiences: much less will they be able to do so when they grow old, and lose the reputation they once had. Their work, we believe, is rather for the world than for the University; and in any proper reform of the academical constitution they ought to disappear as a separate order. We do not grudge the professors of physical science their large salaries, but we think it is really time that they and others of the professoriate, who find so little to do in the University, should be doing something to her credit in the world of authorship. It is in this consciousness of inactivity, we presume, that they have lately suggested the plan of affiliating colleges to the University. According to this plan, theology, and scholarship, and logic would be taught, as they might, in the provinces; and men would come up from Manchester, or Birmingham, or London colleges, to attend scientific lectures in Oxford. In our judgment however, the latter are to be had at least as well in London and elsewhere; but the former cannot really be taught out of Oxford. But then, we do not look at the matter from the side of a professor or an ex-professor.

Oxford wants nothing so much at the present time as to be let alone. The fact is, that the professors and tutors as a body have been far too fond of politics, and have been more anxious to make partizans than scholars, or, at all events, to teach rather than to educate. Indications are not wanting that a change of a salutary nature has begun to set in. But time is needed. The academical state can no more afford a revolution every fifteen years than any other Commonwealth. She has really not yet had time to settle down from her last great convulsion. Excitement and desire for change have been the chief features of her internal politics; and this has left its mark on too many who have attained her highest honours. It is the tendency of competition to destroy attachments; men learn to value everything by money's worth, and so it has been difficult to retain men who have been elected Fellows for the service of the college that has adopted them. We cannot think that men who go off carrying away the proceeds of their fellowship to the best market, after one year's compulsory residence, have deserved well of the University, and we cannot agree with Mr. Smith in thinking that they should have votes given them in Congregation without residence. They have really never entered into the spirit of the place, and are unfaithful to their academical mother.

But all this, along with the other evils above referred to, will soon right itself, if our Constitution-mongers will only be content to let the University alone. The drain upon her classmen for the last few years has been very great indeed. In one year three large collegiate schools were founded; and the opening of the Indian, civil, and political services must of necessity disturb the balance of young men's minds who have the world before them. But when the University (as she is now doing,) enlarges her borders, and the demands upon her are more regular and even, things will re-adjust themselves; the supply will be found equal to the demand: and there will be less, as of speculative laxity, so of political excitement,—and this in spite of Mr. Smith's *dicta* to the contrary, we hold to be the healthy condition of a University—and in this view we believe that we shall carry with us not only all sound Churchmen, but also the more religious among dissenters. To build upon the old foundations should be the maxim of all true reformers. Let new colleges, like that to the memory of Mr. Keble, by all means be founded, and let the old colleges follow the examples so well set by Christ Church and Merton, and enlarge their buildings, or else as Exeter and New Colleges have done, let them put the overplus of their undergraduates in halls presided over by one of their fellows, and it will be found that no revolution is needed in order to attract as large a portion of the youth of England within her walls—at the same time *strengthening her discipline*—as can be spared from the marts of commerce and the other demands of a complicated and highly artificial state of society.

DEAN CLOSE ON RITUALISM.

"The Catholic Revival;" or, Ritualism and Romanism in the Church of England: illustrated from "The Church and the World." By FRANCIS CLOSE, D.D., Dean of Carlisle. London: Hatchard. 1866.

TWENTY-TWO years ago, the Rev. Francis Close, Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham, preached and printed a sermon on that great Protestant festival—now happily extinguished—of Nov. 5, entitled, "The Restoration of Churches is the Restoration of Popery: proved and illustrated from the authenticated publications of the 'Cambridge Camden Society.'" In 1866 the Very Rev. Francis Close, D.D., Dean of Carlisle, publishes a paper read at the Annual Meeting of the "Evangelical Union for the Diocese of Carlisle," some time very near Nov. 5: at least the "paper" was in the hands of the Dean's admirers on or about that date. It seems as if the dim reminiscences of past November 5ths still stir in the Protestant mind, and ferment there till the effervescence must be let off in the shape of a "paper." Hence we suppose the fever of S. G. O. and others.

Those who knew Dr. Close as the Perpetual Curate of Cheltenham will recognise every feature in the "paper" of the Dean of Carlisle; it is the Rev. F. Close all over. He need not have put his name to it; no one would have mistaken the authorship. We are glad to be able to say that this last is not a sermon, as the former was; it was spoken in the more fitting place of a lecture-room. The latter publication is the counterpart of the former and has the like employment of small capitals, of italics, and notes of admiration; so that it must have been a trial of skill and patience to the printers to bring it out to the Dean's satisfaction. However, we cannot but think that, if the Dean of Carlisle lives five years longer, he will not be disposed to reprint his "paper;" we are quite sure that he would not now reprint his sermon of 1844, for, not long ago, to the dismay of some of his old admirers of Cheltenham, he, by implication, retracted much of what he had said in that sermon. The experience of ten years as Dean has reconciled him to two things, which once he would have denounced as Popish—choral daily service, and a restored cathedral; and he has had the honesty to declare this publicly, even in the face of the reproaches of the "Record;" and we venture to predict that, if the Dean of Carlisle were to worship daily in a church where Catholic ritual was fully carried out, he would, in half that time, bear testimony to its spiritual character, and its tendency to produce—taking only a low view of the matter—reverential and devotional feelings.

The main, if not the only, objection that persons of Dr. Close's school have to Ritual is, that it is Popish; if once they were disabused of this notion, we believe they would be as devout Ritualists as any. That in ten years' time Evangelicals will find out—that is to say, if there are any Evangelicals left at the end of ten years—that Ritual is not Popery, we do not for a moment doubt. They have discovered that it is not so in the case of architecture; they will discern the like fact in the instance of Ritual. Dean Close is not the only man who denounced Church restoration as essentially and inevitably Popish, and who has been brought round to see his mistake; nearly all his school did so: now they are as earnest and enthusiastic, in the matter of Church restoration, as the most advanced Ritualist. It was stated at the York Congress that the Dean is raising funds to restore the nave of his cathedral; we earnestly hope he may live to see his work done. It will be the same with Ritualism: when once Evangelicals see that there is no Popery in vestments, they will only try who can procure the most beautiful and costly chasubles; just as they are now eager to have the finest churches, organs, music, painted windows, and carving. All this was Popery twenty years ago; it is not so now. Ritualism is Popery now; will it be so ten years hence?

Last year we happened to be in Carlisle Cathedral at matins. There had just been brought in two ancient copes, which had long lain in neglect; they had returned from being repaired and cleaned, by the order and at the expense of the Dean and Chapter: may we venture to hope that, should some great function take place in Carlisle Cathedral—e.g. a meeting of the Church Congress—Dr. Close may be seen heading some magnificent procession, robed in one of these ancient vestments, and publicly proclaiming to the congress that he sees no more unfitness for the dean to be vested in a cope, than for the cathedral to be painted and gilded; no more incongruity in restoring the vestments than in restoring the building; no more Popery in a cope than in a surplice?

Dr. Close, however, does see some good even in the book he so strongly condemns: "These Ritualists will have done us good service, if, by their reproofs, they excite the Evangelical body to greater zeal, love, holiness, and self-denial." He might have added, larger charity and deeper study, and a keener apprehension of the needs of the Church at the present day, and the tendency of religious mind and thought. Has Dr. Close ever asked himself where is the Evangelical body? Where are the clergy who are to take the places of Drs. Close, Goode, M'Neile, and others? Is it not a matter of complaint with them that they cannot get able Evangelical curates? Have not the Simeon Trustees a difficulty in making fitting appointments to vacant charges? Had not they a difficulty in supplying a successor to Dr. Close at Cheltenham? Dr. Close is one of those who once gave their minds to the inter-

pretation of prophecy: cannot he, then, discern 'the signs of the times?' Surely it must be clear to any one's apprehension that a mighty change is passing over the religious mind of England, and that there is a rising tide which no Mrs. Partington can keep from her doors. Far wiser is it to guide the flood than to oppose it; better be in the ark floating on the surface of the waters, than vainly trying to protect our own little spot, which must ere long be reached by the flood. The Evangelicals of to-day clearly see the mistake the High-and-Dry of the last century made in opposing the popular feeling; the next generation will equally wonder at the blindness and obstinacy of some Evangelicals, who, like Dean Close, are fighting against a power which must in the end prevail.

We shall now take our leave of Dr. Close personally, to follow up a train of thought suggested by his two publications—the connection between restored architecture and restored ritual; for this connection is by no means so universally acknowledged and seen as it ought to be.

Within these last thirty years there has grown up, and we may say been perfected, a school of architects, who are competent to build a new church in any style, or to restore an old church to its original design. They turn it over to the parish priest as completed; yet, when he comes, he finds the ritual arrangements utterly inadequate: perhaps a low, mean altar, with no proper footpace extended in front; actually rendering it almost impossible to celebrate according to the order of the Book of Common Prayer! Sometimes this happens through ignorance, sometimes through carelessness, sometimes through the wilfulness of Protestant prejudice. In the latter category we must place one who holds the highest place in popular estimation as a church restorer, Mr. Gilbert Scott. The sole idea of church architecture which these last seem to have is this, that it is a science *per se*, without reference to the worship to be celebrated within its walls: a building has to be constructed according to a certain plan which prevailed at a certain period; externally the minutest points of design are reproduced, but its congruity with the Ritual to be employed in it is scarcely thought of.

As an example of what we mean, we shall take an instance in a case we know:—A neighbour of ours lately restored his church: its original is Norman, with later additions. He restored the chancel in Norman. The chancel-arch had wholly disappeared; accordingly, he put in a new one. Being a Ritualist, he took care that the restored church should be fully adapted to the order of worship prescribed in the Prayer Book; his new chancel-arch, accordingly, was as wide as the walls would allow, with as little of a projecting jamb as possible, so that the priest, in saying matins and evensong, or in celebrating at the altar, can be seen by nearly

the whole congregation. The church was visited by a secretary of an architectural society, who immediately found fault with this arch, declared that its jambs should have been advanced, and the span of the arch narrower. On its being objected that such an arrangement would conceal the priest from being seen, especially when in his stall, the secretary answered that he might have a reading-desk in the nave. In other words, his idea was that the order of worship should be quite subordinate to some supposed architectural propriety; just as if an architect were to build a dwelling-house, not to suit the comfort or convenience of the owner, but to exhibit some æsthetic principle. Surely the church was built for the worshippers, not the worshippers made for the church; the church is constructed to suit the Ritual, not the Ritual to subserve the church. Was the Ritual of the Tabernacle, or of Solomon's Temple, adapted to the building, or was the building adapted to the Ritual? The whole idea of a building is, that therein may be conducted the worship of God in its proper order; never that the worship is to give way to certain supposed architectural requirements.

But we may go further: we affirm that this crotchet of certain modern architects is wholly contrary to the principles of the mediæval architects, whose rules and canons, we are told, should be rigidly followed. Why is it that so many of our old Norman chancels have disappeared, and have been replaced by those of a later period, but that mediæval architects found the old Norman chancel unfitted for the advanced Ritual of latter times, and consequently that the building must be adapted to the Ritual? Should not, then, modern architects act on the principles of their mediæval prototypes, and see, before all things, that their restorations accord with the requirements of modern Ritual? Most of our old Norman country churches were built at a time when very little of the land was cultivated; perhaps there were a dozen houses in the parish; probably the only office used in the church was the mass: a narrow church, consisting of nave and chancel—the latter short, the altar low—would be quite sufficient for such a place and such circumstances; the priest with his one acolyte could be seen by the twelve or fourteen persons, who stood or knelt near the chancel-arch, and who composed his congregation. As population increased and Ritual advanced, this arrangement would not suffice; so the architects of those days pulled down the old narrow and inadequate chancel, and built up a new one of such proportions as were needed for the change of circumstances; so we come to the magnificent chancels of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

The reformed Ritual requires a deep chancel, to hold, what is daily becoming more indispensable, a surpliced choir. The increase of population necessitates aisles to the nave: it follows, then, that these two considerations should regulate all restorations. The

priest and choir in the chancel should be seen and heard of all ; the altar should be so much raised, that the sight of it be not impeded by the intervening choir. Let, then, modern architects, *when they can*, follow the example of their predecessors, adapt the churches to the Ritual. We do not counsel them to pull down Norman chancels and chancel-arches, even when obviously unfitted for modern Ritual ; but we do counsel them to have Ritual in view before they undertake either a new building or a restoration.

We were informed at the York Congress that Dean Close is proposing to restore the nave of Carlisle Cathedral, for the special purpose of having it used as a place of preaching. We earnestly hope he may succeed, and, before the close of his life, preach the opening sermon himself. We would go further : we would, in cathedrals like Carlisle, where the choir is cut off from the nave and transepts, have matins and evensong sung in the nave, keeping the choir for its proper office, the Holy Eucharist ; matins, with a sermon, in the nave, followed by the choir, canons, and the faithful, entering the chancel for a choral celebration, would be no unfit arrangement ; it would only accord with circumstances. In Durham, on the contrary, where the screen has been removed, we would still have the choir sing matins and evensong in the chancel, but would rigidly exclude the laity until the actual giving of the Sacrament. But, we repeat, no new church should be built without all ritual proprieties being strictly observed.

ROWLEY'S STORY OF THE ZAMBESI MISSION.

The Story of the Universities' Mission to Central Africa, from its commencement, under Bishop Mackenzie, to its withdrawal from the Zambesi. By the Rev. HENRY ROWLEY, one of the two survivors of Bishop Mackenzie's Clerical Staff. With Portraits, Maps, and Illustrations. London : Saunders, Otley, and Co. 1866.

No one who was present at the meeting held in the Sheldonian Theatre, on behalf of the Central African Mission, during the week of the Church Congress at Oxford in 1862, will ever forget the deep sensation with which the report of the committee was received. The great affection and respect in which Bishop Mackenzie was universally held rendered all the more painful the censure which was passed on the proceedings of his last days ; and it was with manifest emotion that some who were amongst his dearest friends felt themselves constrained to speak their minds as to the

impropriety of a Christian Bishop engaging in hostilities with the Ajawa tribes; but whatever difference of opinion there might have been on the abstract question, all were agreed that there could be no doubt of the purity and disinterestedness of the Bishop's motives. To censure one on whom a martyr's grave had so recently closed, and for whose loss the tears of his friends at home were scarcely dried, was in any case a painful task; but it was more especially so in that of Bishop Mackenzie, whose genial graces had won all hearts, and enlisted all sympathies in behalf of the mission that he led. It is interesting now to learn, from Mr. Rowley's narrative, that the Bishop anticipated this censure, and knew that it must be pronounced by his friends at home, who would reason on the abstract principle, without being able to comprehend the exact position in which the missionaries were placed.

All, however, is now explained; and if Mr. Rowley does not convince us that there are circumstances under which it may be lawful for the ambassadors of the Prince of Peace to bear the arms of carnal warfare, it must at least increase our admiration for that disinterested generosity which was willing to incur the censure of those whose approbation must naturally have been, next to God's favour, the object of his fondest desire. No one can read Mr. Rowley's book without feeling that, if it was an error, it was better to err with Bishop Mackenzie than to do rightly with most other men. It need not alter our opinion, but it will soften anything that was harsh in our judgment, when we read the plain and simple narrative of the story of the mission.

Mr. Rowley's book is opportune for other reasons. It answers without design, and therefore more convincingly, all that Sir Samuel Baker has said respecting the utter depravity of the African character. Mr. Rowley is a man of more genial sympathies than the great explorer whom the nation now delights to honour. He has lived amongst the African tribes in a more intimate relation, and has had greater opportunities of studying their capabilities than fell to the lot of Sir Samuel; and whilst he speaks hopefully of their future conversion, he furnishes us with the solid data on which his opinion is grounded. Moreover, Mr. Rowley's book is indirectly an answer to some aspersions which have been cast by Dr. Livingstone on the conduct of the mission. It is quite true that Dr. Livingstone advised Bishop Mackenzie not to engage in any hostilities with the natives after his departure, but he forgets that the greater number of these conflicts had taken place whilst he was with the missionaries, and that they were undertaken by his advice, and in the first instance against the judgment of the Bishop himself. It was by following his advice, and constituting themselves the knight-errants of the Shire valley, that they had placed themselves in a position from which they found it difficult to recede.

But besides the interest which must attach to the plain narrative by an eye-witness of facts which we have so often discussed, the volume is in itself one of no ordinary merit. It is by far the most interesting and readable book of missionary travels which has for a long time past met our eye. The genial sympathy of the writer with all nature, and more especially with human nature, even the African type, degraded as it is by the superstitions of heathenism; the judicious omission of the mere details of every-day routine which make most books of travel so wearisome; and the breadth of view and gentle spirit which pervade every page, all contribute to this end; and it is altogether so graphic, unpretending, and natural, that at its close we can scarce tell whether the skill of the writer or the tragic interest which belongs to its subject lends it the greater charm.

Mr. Rowley begins the story from the beginning, and continues it to the arrival of Bishop Tozer and his own subsequent departure for England. The interest aroused on behalf of the Central African tribes by Dr. Livingstone, and the glowing description which he had given of the beauty and fertility of the valleys of the Shire and Zambesi, which promised, by the culture of cotton, to substitute a lucrative and honourable commerce for the abominable slave-traffic carried on by the Portuguese, produced a deep sensation; and never did mission go forth with greater signs of encouragement. On October 22, 1860, a farewell service was held in Canterbury Cathedral, and four days afterwards the Bishop elect, accompanied by the Rev. L. J. Procter, the Rev. H. C. Scudamore, Mr. Horace Waller, lay superintendent, a carpenter, and an agriculturist, sailed from Plymouth for Capetown, where the Bishop elect was to receive consecration. Other members of the mission, including the Bishop's sisters and other ladies, were to follow in a few months.

In the following December Mr. Rowley proceeded to the Cape, when he found that the whole party, which had been increased by the addition of four Christianized Africans, had departed. Some had gone on to the Zambesi a fortnight before, but the Bishop, Mr. Procter, and two of the Africans, had only left the previous evening, and therefore Mr. Rowley was able to join them at Natal, from whence they proceeded, in H.M.S. "Lyra," to the Zambesi. The anticipations formed of this river from Dr. Livingstone's description were destined, even at its mouth, to receive a check:—

"My first impressions," says Mr. Rowley, "of the Zambesi were not favourable. After the glorious coast-line from the Cape to Natal, the low mangrove-covered shore before us presented a very discouraging prospect. The ideas I had entertained received a rude shock, for nothing could look more impracticable for ordinary commercial purposes than the entrance to the Zambesi. The anchorage outside is not good:

we were seven miles from land, and had but seven and a half fathoms of water, and a more exposed position for ships cannot well be imagined. The officers of the Royal Navy are not apt to magnify difficulties, but those about me in no measured terms condemned the Zambesi. According to them no sailing-vessel could enter the river; no boat, save under very favourable circumstances, could cross the bar without imminent danger to life, and they laughed at the notion of the Zambesi ever furnishing a commercial port. A short time before one of the 'Lyra's' boats, while taking in letters for Dr. Livingstone, was upset on the bar, and Mr. Paymaster Leveke, a most estimable officer, drowned; and previous to this an entire boat's crew, with the exception of one man, had been lost in attempting the same passage for the same purpose. With the aid of a small steam-tug, sailing-vessels of light tonnage might be towed into and out of the river; but from all I could see and learn, I felt sure that only the prospect of a very large profit indeed would tempt commercial men to encounter the difficulties of the Zambesi,"—Pp. 5, 6.

Dr. Livingstone had been for some time waiting at the mouth of the river, in expectation of the "Pioneer," the schooner which was sent out from England for his use. He immediately communicated to the Bishop his opinion that a better path to the interior might be found by way of the Rovuma, a river four hundred and fifty miles north of the Zambesi, which was supposed to flow either from the Lake Nyassa or its neighbourhood. He did not say that he was under orders from England to explore the Rovuma, but suggested it to the missionaries as a more convenient road to their destination. The plan did not approve itself to the judgment of the Bishop and his staff, as they had come out, not to explore rivers, but to preach the gospel. Dr. Livingstone, however, urged it so vehemently, and made so many objections to their proceeding at once to the Shire, that, much as they disliked the delay, they felt at last that too great a weight of responsibility would rest upon them, if any evil befell them, while they were acting contrary to the advice of the only man who was supposed to know the country. It was then arranged that the "Pioneer" was to proceed at once to the Rovuma, whilst the "Lyra" went first to Johanna, where she was to leave Mr. Procter and others with the stores, and then to the Rovuma with the Bishop and Mr. Rowley.

Arrived at the Rovuma, the Bishop and Mr. Rowley were transferred to the "Pioneer," and with Dr. Livingstone commenced the ascent of the river on the 18th of March. They had not proceeded far before they found the navigation of the river continually interrupted by sand-banks; and on the 19th it became evident that they had gone as far as they safely could without the risk of being stranded for months. The water was rapidly falling, and one of two alternatives must be adopted. They must either return at once to the Zambesi, and resume their original plan, or else they

must push on as far as they could, and, when they could go no further, halt, and go amongst the people as missionaries, whilst Dr. Livingstone and his party proceeded overland to Lake Nyassa. This, however, would have been a departure from the original intention of the mission, and the people were too much under the influence of the half-caste Arab to make it a desirable station. Dr. Livingstone was very anxious to proceed overland to Lake Nyassa; but it was his turn now to yield to the wishes of the Bishop, and this he did with a good grace. It was evident that he had made a mistake in bringing the mission party up the Rovuma; but, with a disinterestedness which does him great credit, he resolved at once to return to the Zambesi.

When the missionaries prepared for the ascent of the Zambesi, it was discovered that the delay which the Rovuma expedition entailed was a greater misfortune than they had anticipated. It was necessary to leave two thirds of the stores behind at Johanna, in consequence of the quantity of coal which the "Pioneer" required, for which there would have been no need if she had gone up the river in February. After they had passed the bar of the river, their progress appears to have been most favourable until they reached the Shire; and here for the first seventy miles they found the channel deep and the navigation easy. For the first hundred miles the valley of the Shire presented no promising appearance; it varied in width from ten to fifty miles, and was shut in by two ranges of hills which ran in the general direction of the river; but the valley is nothing but a succession of pestiferous swamps, and the population in consequence very scanty.

The further they went, the more difficult they found the navigation, as the "Pioneer" was continually aground. Whilst they were ascending the Shire with the purpose of making a settlement in the interior, they found the country round in a disturbed state. The Manganja were the original owners of the soil, but the Ajawa, a braver and more warlike tribe, who had been driven out of their lands higher up, had been forced to seek settlements amongst the Manganja. Hence had arisen a hostile feeling between the tribes which was carefully fostered by the Portuguese, who found the slave market supplied by the captives which each took from the other. It appears at first as if the mission party considered the Ajawa altogether in the wrong, but the sequel showed that, on further acquaintance with both tribes, the Ajawa improved in their estimation. Before any occasion arose for the use of arms the question of the lawfulness of bearing them was discussed.

"About this time we had much conversation with regard to the course we should adopt, as Christian Missionaries, in case we were ever attacked by the natives. Two questions arose:—

"1st. Should we take guns with us on the journey to the highlands?

"2nd. If we took them, for what purpose should we take them?"

"The Bishop was against taking guns for any purpose whatever, but Dr. Livingstone and others belonging to the expedition had very different ideas upon this matter. Dr. Livingstone said, 'By all means take them, and, if necessary, use them, for they are the greatest pacificators in the world, if you have peaceful intentions yourself. The Ajawa and all other tribes knowing you to be well armed, would assist you, for the natives will never dream of attacking you unless you are defenceless.'"—P. 102.

On the 9th of July they halted at Chibisa's. Here Mr. Rowley was to remain whilst the Bishop and Dr. Livingstone proceeded to the highlands. After the Bishop had departed on the 17th, Mr. Rowley saw a large party of men armed with guns cross the river in canoes. The captain of the band was a Portuguese, and it was evidently a slaving party from Tete going up to the hills to get slaves.

"It seemed," says Mr. Rowley, "a horrible thing to permit these men to go on their errand of crime unchecked, but we had no authority to interfere with them. We could do nothing but watch them, as they went off on their mission of wickedness.

"While watching these people, some of the men who had gone up the hills with the Bishop to our surprise came on to the island. They were in a state of greatest excitement, and from their statements we learned that they went up as far as Mbame's village, and that when there, a party of Chakundas (slavers) had entered the village; that the English had driven them away, after taking their guns and property from them, and had set the slaves free! Presently more men came, and with them some of the property taken from the slavers—a gun, a number of hoes, earthenware pots, brass armlets, &c. One of these men had a letter from Dr. Livingstone to Mr. Gedy, the officer in charge of the ship, which, after stating that they had the day before released eighty-four slaves and dispersed the slavers, gave instruction to Mr. Gedy to man the boats and go up and down the river, as another party of slavers had escaped him and would be down the river with their slaves almost immediately. The slaves were to be retained, the slavers dispersed, and the Chibisians were to be enlisted on our side by a promise of all the booty they could take from the slavers. The freed captives were to be brought to the island, and fed until they could be returned to their own homes."—Pp. 125, 126.

The released captives were told by Dr. Livingstone that those who had homes and friends were free to return to them; but it was found that more than half had no homes to go to. After consulting with the Bishop, the Doctor told them that they might go with the Missionaries and settle where they settled, and that they would protect and feed them until they could feed themselves. This was the foundation of the little colony which Bishop Mackenzie gathered round him at Magomera.

In the meantime Messrs. Procter and Scudamore were left at Soche's village in charge of the released slaves. The work of rescuing captives had now commenced, and was carried on by Dr. Livingstone and the Bishop, and consequently their party was continually increasing. When they reached Magomera they found the whole country round in fear of the Ajawa, who were everywhere, they were told, destroying the villages and making captives of their inhabitants. Chigunda, the chief of Magomera, told them that most of the villages round were deserted, but if the Bishop would remain with him, he would not run away. On Dr. Livingstone's advice Magomera was selected as the mission station, although the Bishop preferred Soche's village. More skirmishing with the Ajawa followed, in which Dr. Livingstone took part, and after he had left Magomera the Manganja continually sought the assistance of the Mission party against the Ajawa. Dr. Livingstone, when asked by the Bishop whether he thought it possible that circumstances could arise which would necessitate their fighting, had said, "No. You will be oppressed with requests; but do not go." He might have thought that what had been already done was sufficient to establish the prestige of the English name, or that the Ajawa would cease their depredations when they found that the Missionaries were settled at Magomera, but a little reflection would have shown him that this advice was more easy to give than to act on. The Manganja could not see why one Englishman should not fight in their defence as well as another, nor why it was wrong for the Missionaries to do, after the Doctor had left, that which was right whilst he was with them. After a war policy had once commenced it was no easy matter to withstand the importunity of the Manganja chiefs, who represented the happiness and prosperity which would be restored to the land if the incursions of the Ajawa were checked.

The Bishop and his companions felt the gravity of the occasion, and solemnly took counsel together after the reception of the Holy Communion; and then they unanimously resolved that, if the Manganja would agree to certain conditions, they would aid them; and none can doubt but that in coming to this resolution they had one object alone in view, the promotion of the honour and glory of God.

The chiefs met to receive their answer, and the conditions proposed were these, that they would bind themselves never to sell men, women, or children again; that all the captives found with the Ajawa should be perfectly free; that they would unite to punish any chief who should sell his own people, or the people of any other chief; that each chief would promise to punish any of his own people who should be found engaging in the slave trade; and that if Portuguese or any foreign slavers should come into the land they would drive them away, or at once inform the Bishop of their

presence. When the chiefs had assented to all these conditions it was agreed that they should all start for the Ajawa camp the next day. When they came to the camp at the foot of Mount Zomba, the bishop resolved to seek a conference with the Ajawa chiefs in order to induce them to leave the country peaceably ; but first he called all the Christians around him, and offered up a prayer to God that He would be with them in that which they were about to do, and that He would incline the Ajawa to go away peaceably ; but if not, that He would protect them and give them victory, and for CHRIST'S sake forgive the sins of all who might fall that day, whether white or black, friend or foe.

The Ajawa refused the parley, and an engagement was the consequence. The details of the fight are beyond our present purpose, but the reflections of an eye-witness cannot be otherwise than interesting. They are as follows :—

“ In words written on the spot—for I merely adapt my journal—I have thus described that event which produced so much disapprobation from many who are justly ranked among our wisest and best friends. I was not greatly surprised when I heard they had condemned this act. All things considered, it would have been strange if they had not condemned it. They were perfectly right *in the abstract*, but we had not abstract circumstances to deal with, and abstract principles were not, in our estimation, at all sufficient for the emergency of our position ; and I feel certain that had those who condemned us been with us, they would have done just as we did. We felt as strongly as they the horror of taking up arms against a fellow-creature, but we could no more resist doing what we did than they, if no other aid was at hand, could resist felling to the earth—supposing them to have the power—the wretch they found beating to death a woman or a child. If Africa is to be Christianised, a large, a very large, discretion must be given to those who undertake the work.

“ No greater mistake can be made than to suppose that men who go out there can at all times act as though they possessed all the appliances of civilisation and Christianity, or as though the antecedents of the natives were like our own.

“ I have frequently been asked if we, in this contest with the Ajawa, killed many. Unhesitatingly I say, No. I should doubt if more than five were killed, and they certainly not by our guns ; the Manganja caught a body of Ajawa in retreat, and some fell then. When they found our guns carried so far, a superstitious fear came upon them, and they retreated at once. By what we did I have no doubt we saved, for a time, many hundreds from death or slavery, for after these events no slave trader came within many miles of our station.”—Pp. 169, 170.

The work of the missionaries was not yet however done. The ease with which the Ajawa had been driven off made the Manganja regard them as the possessors of irresistible power. They thought at first the prowess of the English lay in the potent charm of some

war medicine which they possessed. The Manganja, they said, have brave hearts, but when they go to fight the Ajawa, they all run away, not because they have not brave hearts, but because the Ajawa have a stronger war medicine than they; but the English have such strong war medicine that if only one of them went against the Ajawa, they would all run away. When the missionaries were unable to satisfy the demand for war medicine, the Manganja renewed their importunity for more martial aid. The Bishop supposed that when they had broken up the Ajawa camp, the invaders after the repulses they had received would be glad to return to their own land, but so it did not prove, and for the best of all reasons that they had no land of their own to go to. They found the Ajawa were still on every side, and the Manganja were continually seeking their aid. With extreme reluctance the mission party again sallied forth to the aid of a chief named Nampeko, but no sooner did the Ajawa hear the cry, "The English are here," than they fled. Their deserted camp was full of plunder, which the Manganja retained, and then the camp was destroyed. The captives, five hundred in number, were released, and of them nearly fifty women and children wished to go with the bishop. On the difficulty of feeding them being suggested, the bishop with his wonted generosity exclaimed, "It is very well to be prudent, but when you meet with such as these, you act on the principle, 'God has sent you these people to feed, trust to Him to supply you with food.'"

At Magomera the missionaries had now a large establishment, and the released captives consisting as they did of a mixed company of Ajawa and Manganja seemed a nucleus for spreading a knowledge of Christianity through the country round; and if the result does not appear to have answered the expectation, it must be remembered how many unlooked for difficulties stood in the way. The missionaries had to acquire more knowledge of the language of the people before they could instruct them in the truths of Christianity, and Bishop Mackenzie seems to have held a strong opinion, which, however, was not the general feeling of the missionaries, that converts ought not to be baptized until they saw some reasonable prospect of remaining in their present settlement. Dying children were baptized, but these were all that were added to the Church.

Nevertheless, seed was sown which will doubtless bear its fruit, when in God's good providence the work commenced by Bishop Mackenzie shall be taken up by his successor. The bishop's rule at Magomera was wise and gentle; he taught his dependents at least to respect Christianity. Much natural generosity and gratitude was found amongst the people, but higher virtues could scarcely be looked for in those who were strangers to the grace of God. Humanly speaking, there was fair promise of success, and

the hopefulness with which the missionaries regarded their position was not ill-founded; but God's providences are mysterious, and the victories of the faith are often brought about through apparent failures.

The rainy season came, and soon it was evident that Dr. Livingstone's advice as to the choice of Magomera had not been wise. The unhealthiness of the place was daily more apparent, and it was soon determined that they must abandon the settlement on which they had spent so much labour, and to which they had grown so much attached. It was after this was decided on, that the last warlike expedition was undertaken, in which the missionaries engaged. This time it was in consequence of a chief, named Manasomba, having robbed Messrs. Scudamore and Procter. The village as usual was deserted on the approach of the English, and was destroyed as a punishment on Manasomba for his treachery. On this we give Mr. Rowley's own reflections, though we cannot quite follow him in his argument:—

“Good people,” he says, “at home, judging of our circumstances by those with which they were surrounded in England, condemned this act as contrary to the spirit of love which should actuate the Christian. I will not argue the point with them, for if they read this simple account of what was done, and of the motives which influenced us, and are not satisfied that our actions and motives were the necessity of our position, I fear no argument I could produce would convince them. As well might they blame the punishment of criminals in England as vindictive and contrary to the spirit of Christianity, as censure us for doing that which our knowledge of the country and people taught us was most suitable for the suppression of crime and the punishment of offenders.”—P. 300.

The bishop's days were now, however, numbered, and his further guidance of the mission was brief. He resolved to proceed to Chibisa's and then go down the river to Malo, the island at the mouth of the Shire, where he hoped to meet his sisters and Mrs. Burrup. A few words will suffice to tell a tale already so well known. In their way from Magomera to Chibisa's they found the mountain streams swollen by the recent rains, and on this account were continually delayed and continually wet. Going down the Shire, the canoe was upset, their medicines were lost, and their stores damaged, and they had to sleep that night in their wet clothes. They were a hundred miles from Magomera, and it was the tenth of January. Dr. Livingstone had named the first for meeting them at Malo, and therefore they expected that he would be impatiently waiting their arrival, but to their great disappointment they found, when they reached Malo, that although the “Pioneer” had passed only a few days before, Dr. Livingstone had not waited for them. He has since expressed surprise that the

bishop, finding he had gone on, did not follow him. To this Mr. Rowley answers, that the bishop might have done so, if he had known for certain that it was only five days since the "Pioneer" had passed, but the Africans expressed themselves so indistinctly that he could not tell whether the few days spoken of might not be two or three weeks. Besides this, it was really useless to follow the "Pioneer," as below Malo the difficulties of the river cease, and she would steam down at the rate of fifty miles or more a day. As Dr. Livingstone had left no letter of instructions for him, the bishop continued to wait for the return of the "Pioneer," but the hardships he had undergone now told upon him; his strength failed, and the island was unhealthy; fever and diarrhœa increased; for five days he lay insensible, and then he died. His grave was dug in haste. It was too dark for Mr. Burrup to read the burial service, but he repeated all of it that he could remember over the grave of the most devoted and single-hearted of God's servants.

Mr. Burrup returned to Magonera only to die and to add his name to the roll of those who have yielded up their lives for the love of their SAVIOUR. The Bishop's intentions were strictly carried out by the surviving members of the Mission, and as soon as possible their settlement was removed to Chibisa's, but trouble followed them here; disease and famine preyed upon them, but it was bravely borne, and each thought not of himself, but of those whom God had committed to their care. The whole conduct of the missionaries during this trying time was heroic, but one by one, Dr. Dickinson, Mr. Scudamore, and Mr. Thornton, yielded up their spirits, and we doubt not that they with their brethren who were first called, are numbered now amidst the noble army of martyrs. And who can doubt but that God has still a purpose of mercy towards the land wherein their bodies rest?

The survivors, Mr. Rowley and Mr. Procter, continued to wait at Chibisa's until the arrival of Bishop Tozer and Mr. Alington. The older members of the Mission were unanimous in thinking that the Shire highlands offered the best, and, under all circumstances, the only position they could occupy in that part of Africa. Nor did they think the attempt to hold it hopeless. Their influence among the surviving Manganja was great; the Ajawa were inclined to be friendly; peace was restored, and not likely soon to be interrupted. They had stores which would last them for eighteen months, and at all events they could not help thinking the attempt to hold that position was fully warranted, considering how much had been paid for their experience, and the estimation which they had gained. There were however difficulties which stood in the way of a return to the hills, but most of the readers of Mr. Rowley's book will regret, we think, that it was not attempted. Before he came up to Chibisa's, Bishop Tozer had instructed Dr.

Steere to go to Quillimane to ask the Governor's permission to occupy Morumbala, if it was found suited for the purpose of the Mission, and it was deemed unadvisable to return to the Shire highlands. Nothing definitely was settled when the Bishop left Chibisa's, but he soon afterwards wrote from Mogara to Messrs. Rowley and Waller, informing them that he had decided to make the experiment of reorganizing the Mission at Morumbala, and giving instructions for its removal from Chibisa's. This involved the giving up of all the people who were under the protection of the missionaries, with the exception of the orphan boys. Even if it had been possible to take them they would have been unwilling to go. The announcement of the removal of the Mission was received with the deepest grief by those who had learnt to regard the missionaries as their natural protectors.

" 'I do not like our English fathers going from us,' said poor Jessiwiringa, 'they said they would never forsake us. It is bad, very bad to lose them. When they are gone, what will happen? The Chakundas (slave dealers) will come and make us slaves again, and then what will become of me and my babe?'"

Mr. Rowley was compelled to return to England on account of his health, when the Mission was withdrawn from Chibisa's, but the rest of the story is soon told. Bishop Tozer's new station, Morumbala, was obliged to be given up in a few months, and that part of Africa was entirely abandoned by the missionaries in 1864. After spending a few weeks at the Cape, and discussing the different plans of future operations which presented themselves, the Bishop determined to make Zanzibar his starting point for the interior. There Bishop Tozer is now carrying on the same plan of operations which Bishop Mackenzie began, educating youths from the interior, studying their language, and translating the Scriptures; but he says he wishes it always to be remembered that he did not select Zanzibar as absolutely a very good field for mission labour, but as the best for ultimately reaching Central Africa; and in a recent letter he declares that he shall not rest satisfied until he finds himself in some sense the bishop of the tribes round Lake Nyassa and the adjoining country in Africa.

Several questions have arisen which require some notice. Dr. Livingstone has cast some reflections on Bishop Tozer's conduct in abandoning the original scheme. The way in which he wrote of this elicited rather an indignant retort in a review of his book by Mr. Halcombe in the July No. of "Mission Life," which we suppose is the organ of the Committee of the Central African Mission. The Bishop of Lincoln and the Archbishop of Dublin have also taken up the question, and defended the course pursued by Bishop Tozer, while a letter from Mr. Procter in the *Guardian* of Nov. 21st, takes an opposite view. Mr. Rowley supplies us with facts

which may help us to form an opinion, while with his usual modesty he withholds his own, which perhaps he thought might weaken the interest which he wishes to kindle on behalf of the Central African Mission. We do not however see that an acknowledgment of error in carrying out details can ever injure a good and holy cause. We cannot read Mr. Rowley's story without seeing that many mistakes have been made. Dr. Livingstone was mistaken in the representation which he made of the fertility of the Zambesi and Shire valleys, and their capabilities as habitations for Europeans; he was mistaken again in his advice respecting the exploration of the Rovuma; he was mistaken in recommending Magomera as a settlement instead of Soche's, to which Bishop Mackenzie's judgment inclined; he was mistaken, perhaps, in engaging in hostilities, and placing the Mission in a position from which it was no easy matter to recede; he was mistaken in not waiting for Bishop Mackenzie at Malo, and therefore we think that after having made so many mistakes himself, he ought not to be quite so hard on Bishop Tozer. At the same time we have little doubt but that Bishop Tozer himself regrets that the original scheme was abandoned without a trial. Indeed he would probably regard it as a mistake himself, for which Mr. Procter has very generously shown us in his letter, that much excuse must be made. Bishop Tozer had no experience of the country, and seemed unwilling to be advised by those who had. At least it appears that before he met Mr. Rowley and Mr. Procter at Chibisa's he had already in his own mind decided to remove the mission to Morumbala. This now proved an error, and led to the ultimate withdrawal to Zanzibar. The Bishop of Lincoln altogether begs the question when he says that after half an hour's conversation with Dr. Livingstone, he and the Bishop of Oxford came away convinced that the maintenance of the Mission in the valley of the Zambesi and Shire was not practicable. It was not a question, he might have known, of maintaining the mission in the *valleys* either of the Zambesi or the Shire, but in the *highlands* which are in the neighbourhood of the Shire. Nor is it much to the purpose that if Bishop Tozer did not go to the highlands himself, Mr. Alington did so on his behalf, as directions were given for the removal of the mission from Chibisa's to Morumbala before any report from Mr. Alington could have been received.

The removal to Morumbala involved the abandonment of the rescued captives and the consequent cessation of the instruction which had been commenced by Bishop Mackenzie, whilst the boys who were under the care of the Mission were taken to Morumbala, but the abandonment of this station involved an evil greater still, which might we think have been avoided. The boys found under the care of Messrs. Procter and Waller at Chibisa's ought to have followed the fortunes of the Mission wheresoever it went.

At Zanzibar their education would have been carried on, and they would have formed a nucleus round which other African youths might have been gathered, but instead of this they were left for Mr. Waller to take to the Cape at his own cost, and the Bishop disclaimed all responsibility respecting them. This we think was a mistake, but nevertheless we are glad to hear that all these youths are doing well, and it is not too much to hope that they may one day return to their own land and declare to their own people the glad tidings of salvation.

We have noticed what we thought to be a mistake as we gathered the facts from Mr. Rowley's most interesting narrative, and our opinion is strongly confirmed by Mr. Procter's letter to the *Guardian*, which we have since read, but still we trust that no man's hand will be stayed in bearing part in this good work. The foundation has been laid ; it may be in sorrow and disappointment, but still there is good hope for the future. It is easy for us, sitting at home at our ease, to criticise the acts of men who have given up the dear delights of home and kindred that they may sing the LORD's song in a strange land, and tell the people that sit in darkness of the light that has arisen ; but we must not forget how much they need our sympathy, our generous trust, and farther still, our tender judgment, when they are far from home, beset with difficulties, and none is at hand to counsel or advise. It may be said by some that precious lives were sacrificed where no adequate results were obtained. The best answer to such an objection is Mr. Rowley's own words, eloquent in their simplicity, and spoken from a heart which had learnt to love more dearly those who fell in what might seem to short-sighted mortals a grand but unsuccessful scheme.

"What did the sorrowing Apostles know of Him for Whom they mourned when they said, 'And we trusted that it should have been He Who should redeem Israel?' And what can we understand of the wisdom and intentions of the Providence which raised up in Bishop Mackenzie a chosen vessel, and allowing him just to breathe the holy name of JESUS to the heathen, then removed him from his work, reserves his labours for another, and withdraws the mission to another part of the wilderness? We can say nothing but 'Thy will be done.' It is not as we hoped ; it is not as we in our blindness expected it would be. But to say that the life and death of Bishop Mackenzie were in vain ; that the life and death of those his fellow-workers, who so soon followed him to the grave, were in vain, is to question the purpose of Almighty God, to murmur at His method of fulfilling His own intention. No, they did not live in vain ; they did not die in vain. That land of darkness and death is consecrated to CHRIST as the resting-place of those good men. Their dust, and the dust also of that little band of native infant Christians, who, as they died of the pestilence and the famine, received Holy Baptism, and in the full purity of their regenerated nature, entered Paradise, will cry aloud to God, 'LORD,

how long wilt Thou hide Thyself, for ever ?' And it will not cry in vain ; but it will be, I doubt not, the first fruits of a glorious resurrection of multitudes from that very land, when our Blessed LORD shall come in glory to gather His people to Himself."—Pp. 484, 5.

We had intended to give some account of those features in the religion and superstitions of the Central African tribes which offer promise of their ready reception of Christianity. This we think one of the most satisfactory portions of Mr. Rowley's very interesting book. In the hope therefore that all who are interested in the Central African Mission will peruse the narrative for themselves, we must dismiss this portion of the subject with a few brief extracts.

"The Manganja and Ajawa are not idolaters ; we met with no instance where they *worshipped* a visible object, under the idea that supernatural power existed in it."—P. 258.

"There are some very hopeful features in the religious belief of the Manganja. Their form of government was something like a theocracy, for though the Rundo was the supreme chief he was not the supreme authority ; there was a higher than he recognized in the affairs of the country. A certain spirit, whether of some great departed chief or no did not clearly appear, whom they called Bona, was supposed to have an abode on the top of a mountain, called Choro, and to him the Rundo resorted for counsel in times of difficulty and danger, so that the Rundo's position was something like that of the judges of Israel ; if he was appealed to by his people he asked guidance of Bona. Bona was supposed to be eminently benevolent ; when his power predominated war did not desolate the land, drought was unknown ; he blessed the seed, and the fruits of the earth abounded ; he was, in fact, a dispenser of peace and plenty, as well as of wise counsel. He had on shore and elsewhere (for he was thought to be ubiquitous,) certain huts consecrated to his service. He was spoken of as having a visible presence, but no one could say they had really seen him, or heard him. His instructions were made through a woman consecrated to his service, who acted as the medium between his people and Bona, and who was vulgarly spoken of as his wife. It was not necessary that the woman elected for betrothment to Bona should be a virgin ; but, after she had become Bona's bride, she was excluded, on pain of death, from the society of all others. But though she was so exclusively devoted to Bona, he appeared to her only in her dreams. If the Rundo wished for Bona's advice, he would proceed, or his deputies, to the top of the mountain with horn-blowing and shouting to make the bride of Bona know of his approach. She then retires to the reclusion of her hut, hears without seeing those that come to her, seeks and finds Bona in sleep, receives from him in this condition that which he wishes her to declare ; and when she awakes she declares to the expectant people the message Bona has given her to deliver."—Pp. 265, 6.

"But this idea of Bona was not their idea of God. Both Manganja and Ajawa seemed to have a better idea of the Deity than more savage tribes. The Manganja called God, Mpambi ; the Ajawa, Mulungu.

Neither looked upon Him as a GOD of wrath. Indeed they did not appear to assign any wrathful attribute to Him, nor did they in any way make Him the author of evil; they supposed evil to proceed from malevolent spirits—the Mfiti. We never, therefore, found them offering up human sacrifices in order to avert GOD's anger. If great danger, either famine or war threatened them, they would assemble at an appointed place, and in an appointed way, offer up prayer to GOD to deliver them from the famine, and give them the victory in the war."

We had selected several interesting passages for quotation, but one more must suffice :

"The Ajawa were not altogether guiltless of man-eating; but it was superstition not hunger that led them to it. Under certain circumstances they ate man, as other tribes will eat lions in order to make them brave. They told us of a certain chief named Niria, against whom the Ajawa fought for a long time without success, and who sustained his cause almost single-handed. When at last he was overpowered and killed, his body was cut up into minute portions, the flesh being eaten by the Ajawa warriors, in order that they might become as valiant in war as he.

"It would not have been difficult to make these people realise the truth, that our souls are strengthened by the Body and Blood of CHRIST, as our bodies are by the bread and wine."—P. 435.

A BENEDICTINE MONASTERY IN THE THIRTEENTH CENTURY. (WESTMINSTER.)

(Continued from p. 539.)

14. THE INFIRMARER.—The lights in the Infirmary, (Sala Infirmarii,) were lighted and put out at the same time as in the Dormitory by the subchamberlain; these were three lights in one cresset, formerly there had been nine. When a monk was ill the whole monastery in courses watched with him, and also whilst he lay dead. After that he was carried through the cloisters to the church, and thence to his grave, which, during thirty days was visited by the convent after chapter.

15, 16. THE HOSTILLARS, External and Internal.—The Internal Hostillar who received guests had always ready beds, seats, tables, towels, scutellas (wash-stands,) lavatoria et battilia (bastiers, saddle-trees?) these the External Hostillar was bound to find as well as straw and litter for beds, and coal for the hearth. The Refectorer provided spoons and cups; the cellarer, bread and drink; the kitchener and pitanciar, pulmentum. On hearing that guests were

arrived from the servant of the outer parlour, the hostillar met them and conducted them into the church for prayer, and thence to the regular parlour, said "Benedicite," gave them the holy kiss, and asked their names and homes; he then took them to the guest house, and sitting down, said some passages of Scripture for their souls' health. The external hostillar saw to their servants, grooms, horses, and carriages, (*vecturas*.) A monk was shown over the whole monastery. All courtesy, honour, and liberality were exhibited. An abbot had three, a prior two loaves, and a monk one loaf, both at dinner and supper, and a *justata* (a measure) of ale. The subsacrist furnished four candles for each monk, and the chamberlain a *cresset*. A prior had eight candles and two tapers, and his chaplain four candles; an abbot received two tapers. A guest-monk was to be proclaimed in chapter if he offended; was not to go outside the precinct without notice to the hostillar, and must attend the obsequies of the dead; he was placed in the outer choir, except he was of S. Edmund's Bury, in which case he went into choir. The hostillar after dinner conducted guests to the guest house. If a monk returned late after Compline he was allowed to go into the tailory, or to the cellarage door, but not into the parlour. If guests had not enough bed-clothes of their own, they were supplied with those of dead monks, as well as with articles of dress and furniture. The External Hostillar received regulars, not Benedictines, who, if they came late after Compline, and the signal of three blows was made by the prior to show that the parlour door could not be opened, were lodged in the outer guest house, or they were furnished with necessaries, and next morning received in the abbey, but had to give account to the abbot for their late arrival. A monk, who was on foot, was lodged in the outer guest house: but if he was proved to be a deserter, (like poor chaplains and clerks,) he had one day's food from the subalmoner and was not received. Friars minors, and preachers were lodged in the outer guest house. When a single guest came in former times the hostillar spent the night with him and said nocturns and matins; and Cistercians were admitted to hall and dortor until the abbots of Boxley and Begeham (Bayham,) and the præcentor of Christchurch, Canterbury, who came as legatine visitors, were denied entrance. In consequence of the number of monks coming, the interior hostillar was given a servant, who, when there were no guests, ate in the outer hostry. This hostillar maintained a *cresset* between the cloister and infirmary door. The extrinsic hostillar's assistant was the subalmoner. All monks, not Benedictines, were introduced by the porter, but Benedictines by the subhostillar. The extrinsic hostillar was to attend matins, masses, processions, and the hours.

17. THE GARDENER had two servants and a dog, for whom he received three knights' loaves daily, and for a portion of the year a monk's corrody. From Valentine's day to Michaelmas he might

go without leave, after as well as before dinner, to the garden ; and if he came back late or after the cymbal had sounded for hall, might dine with the servitors. He was bound to attend all processions round the cloister in copes, albes, or frocks ; all masses in copes or albes, on principal days in church and chapter ; and on special occasions, such as when the refectorer showed his cups. He found pittances on the Translation of King Edward, and the Nativity of S. John Baptist, beans on the latter day ; and on S. James' day, apples, cherries, plums, large nuts, and mespila (medlars ;) and on the Vigil of S. Laurence, fast days, Wednesdays and Fridays, and on Mondays, Thursdays, and Fridays in Advent and Lent ; and apples on Septuagesima Sunday.

18. **THE CUSTOS OF THE LADY CHAPEL** had a clerk, and six brethren were tabled for the masses. At the Assumption and Purification he lighted twenty tapers on the beam before the altar, fifty round the altar, tapers in the angels' hands, and two at the feet of Abbot Berkynge. A light burned night and day. Formerly there were two lamps hanging from an iron rod, and a taper in a basin. On three feasts he gave twenty shillings in bread to the poor. Out of the rents of certain houses he found tombs for the dead monks.

19. **THE REFECTORER** received from the baker daily six loaves for the abbot, one for each monk, a large loaf for the president in hall, another for the hebdomadary of high mass, four loaves for the nuns of Kylburne, two for the mixtum of the four servitors of kitchen and the reader's table, one for the breakfast (*agenticula s. dignariæ*) of visitors, and one for the præcentor's writer. The loaves for the abbot when resident or *apud insulam*, and his chaplains, he passed to the cellarer, and informed the baker when simnels were to be provided, on feasts in copes and principal anniversaries, and gastels (large cakes,) or miches (loaves of bouted bread,) on feasts in albes, twice a week in Advent and Lent. He tasted the beer to see it was good. His servants drew it from the cask in the cellarage, and filled the brethren's measures for dinner and the drink of charity.

20. **THE ALMONER** delivered to the abbot at Christmas sixty-five ells of russet or other cloth for twenty-five poor folk, and the common groom of the almonry had three ells. The subalmoner gave the *potum caritatis* to the infirm, found the rods in chapter and vestry, the brooms for the tables in hall, with baskets to collect the fragments, and the broad dish at the high table for the abbot's alms ; received the briefs of the dead in the parlour and gave them to the succentor, and distributed food to the prisoners at the gate. He visited with two servants houses outside the monastery and gave them relief, first seeing that all women went out ; and one of his servants gave relief to sick women. Twice every week he gave beer, nine loaves from the bakehouse, and the fragments to all poor coming to the almonry, or, as it was called, the dole-

house. The brief bearers, priest and servants of the almonry, received corrodies, flacons, canestella, brachinella, and wafers. One of his servants attended in the parlour.

THE CHURCH.—At the form in choir stood the chanter on great days in a cope, or sometimes two, deacons or priests. At the mass for a dead brother, three or four who sang the gradual and tract. Three tapers burned perpetually, hanging before the high altar, and four others in silver basons, given by Henry III., two in the centre, and two, one on the north [of S. Edward's chapel,] over the tomb of Queen Edgitha, and one on the south over the tomb of Queen Matilda, were lighted on feasts in copes, and at mass and vespers of anniversaries. There was besides the high altar an altar in choir. Besides these were five lamps. 1. At the altar of Holy Cross, burning always at high mass, and during Divine Service on festivals. 2. At S. Paul's and the Crucifix, the feet of which are kissed by people coming up on one, and descending on the other side. 3. At old S. Mary's altar. 4. The Trinity altar. And 5. S. Benedict's altar. A light burned on the west side of the choir door, another at the antiphonar desk during matins, and a third in the Watcher's chamber.

From Easter to All Saints the choir, or oratory, was strewn with salt marsh-rush, and at other times with hay. A candelabrum, with seven branches, was lighted during the octaves of great feasts, and the Coronation-robe of Edward the Confessor was exhibited on the day of his burial and Christmas-day. All the reliquaries (*reliquarium philacteriæ*) were carried in procession on the Rogation days, with the larger shrines, and then exposed on the Matin altar. After the bell began for the hours or the chapter, or the high mass, no one could sing a private mass without the prior's leave; but such masses were ordinarily said before Prime, but when Prime was said *summo mane*, after the Litany there followed the chapter (*capitalis*) mass. Between the two choirs on one side was the *trinculûm*, or bench for a monk under punishment.

THE REFECTORY.—At first the ale was served in two great tankards or bollets, and the pitchers of those who had conventual livery were filled; and the measures of the brethren, at the refectorer's nod by his servants, who washed them twice a week, and when wine was served. Before hall all the cups were set on table; and if there were few monks in hall they were to sit far apart, so that the tables might seem filled. There was no supper for two days whilst the newly-professed novices wore albes. A lamp burned before the table of the "*minuti*" from Holy Cross day; and on the two festivals of S. Edward the crown was filled with thirty-four lamps, thirteen tapers, and at least a hundred candles. A great cup was set before the president, with knives and a silver

salts; two cups; two silver basons, with an ewer of brass for warm water; towels and napkins, for the abbot's hands, for his bread, and bringing up cheese, were set before the abbot. The misericord seats had mats, and the refectory was strewn with hay three times, and rushes seven times a year, on vigils of the ten principal feasts, the expenses being defrayed from Feringen's church. Clean table-cloths were supplied by a yearly sum of fifty-four shillings out of rents in the city, within and without the walls. Spoons were set before the monks which were collected before the close of dinner, the abbot's being taken up apart with the middle finger of the right hand. Silver cups for wine were distributed by the refectorer, or the servitor novices, from the high table, and taken back thither. Cheese was carried up the middle of the hall to the president, and then to the brethren. The refectorer might only speak curtly in hall, unless with a member of the royal family, a bishop, abbot, or great nobleman. In early times if he wished to speak to his servants he took them to the cellar-door. Four guests were invited by the abbot daily, and five in hall by the convent at high table. The fishermen who brought S. Peter's salmon were to dine at the table of the "*minuti*." Two towels hung at the high table (*superiorem*), and two on either side of the kitchen-window. The reader (*mensæ lector*) and four servitors of kitchen left choir shortly before the rest of the brethren, and went into the refectory for the mixtum; and the refectorer or his mate at once served them each with a measure of beer, the fourth of a loaf, and a half-portion (*ferculi*), or three eggs at certain days from the kitchen. The subkitchener and novices *sub custodiâ* might also have mixtum. Each said "*Benedicite*" and "*Cibum et potum servorum suorum Filius Dei benedicat*," making the sign of the Cross; and after his meal "*Adjutorium*;" "*Sit nomen Domini*;" "*Retribuere*;" "*Fidelium animæ*;" and then went back to the Hour Sexts or Nones. The cymbal sounded for dinner, supper, or potum conventus. The president entered with his head bare and his hands crossed, and took his seat on the prior's side; the monks stood in the order of their profession as in chapter, upright, looking inwards (*extraversum*), bowing only to the abbot, who never came to supper or *biberes*. He then bowed and slowly rang the skylla, so that any in church or dortor might come without hurry. The chanter or succentor sang "*Benedicite*," "*Gloria Patri*," and the Lord's Prayer, while all bowed and turned to the east. When the priest finished the benediction all sat down. The reader at the step said "*Jube Domine*," and having received the blessing began to read; and after the first clause the monks uncovered their bread. If the reader had forgotten his book, or lost his place, he said for the first clause, "*Deus est caritas . . . et Deus in eo*." No one but the abbot or *custos ordinis*, who was president, might sit at

the skylla, which was to his right hand. He gave the signal to the reader to stop, and for the collection of the spoons and fragments. A Benedictine prior, having a convent of twelve brethren, sat on the abbot's side, the priors of Hurley and Malvern excepted; The priors of S. Edmund's, Worcester, and Malmesbury, who were free of the chapter;¹ and those of S. Alban's, Canterbury, Rochester, and Ramsey, might sit at high table if the abbot was not present. Two custodes ordinis were always to be present, as the junior kept the parlour-key, the door being opened for guests, and after chapter and closed before hall; and if the senior had friends whom he kept with him after hall, the junior could go out with the convent, and make the rounds of the infirmary. At dinner, supper, and potum caritatis, all stood in front of their cups, on the step before their tables, and bowed, fronting eastward, at the Gloria Patri, before refection and the benediction at the potum. The kitchen-window was then closed. Those who entered late with bare heads made satisfaction at the step, and bowed, asking permission to eat or drink, adding, "Benedicite," "Oculi omnium," or "Edent pauperes," and the priest gave the benediction with the sign of the Cross. The abbot or prior could send for a monk to dine with them. Guests sat on the prior's side when the abbot was present, and on the abbot's side if the prior presided; a bishop sat in the middle under the Majesty. After hall the abbot or prior took their guests into their own chamber; but if the subprior, third or fourth prior presided, then the intrinsic hostillar also remained with them after dinner, in order to conduct them back to the hostry; or else they were taken, if the hostry was full, to the long chamber next the refectory (*nisi nunc est camera prioris*,) probably on the site of Lord John Thynne's prebendal house; but the modern use was, to the chapel of S. Dunstan, probably that known as the Pyx Chamber. If the abbot or prior made a signal to a custos ordinis to entertain their guests after hall, they being called elsewhere, wine and ale were furnished in the hostry in S. Dunstan's chapel; but if it was a simple brother who acted as deputy host, then the place assigned was behind the refectory door, and silence was to be kept. The abbot, whether in the isle, or his chamber, or in hall, had six loaves from the cellarer, a justata of ale furnished by the pitanciar, and not as formerly by the cellarer, a sextary of wine, and three monks' portions from the kitchen. A monk's friend dined at high table, but did not remain after hall. The president gave permission to invite friends, each had a justata of

¹ The confederated monasteries in union with Westminster were Hurley, Malvern, Malmesbury, S. Alban's, Winchester, Worcester, Bury, S. Mary, York, S. John Baptist, Colchester, S. Milburga, Wenlock, Reading, Bermondsey, Tewksbury, Rochester, Shrewsbury, Ely, S. Bennet, Ramsey, Canterbury, and Cirencester; and one foreign house, Fécamp.

ale and a monk's bread, but three, four, or five had three justatæ between them. A Benedictine abbot had three loaves and a justata of ale, and like a conventual prior had a justata of ale at collation, or, if wine was given, a sextary of wine. A prior had two loaves and one justata of ale for dinner, and if wine was served half a sextary; a justata of ale at supper, and one justata at collation. The cellarer, forensic hostillar, kitchener, and pitanciar furnished these portions. All bread left and fragments were carried to the almonry, but the refectorer and subalmoner had the whole bread and leavings of ale—the subhostillar intrinsic had, if a second loaf was served, and remained on table. Before and after dinner the prior, or the next in rank, furnished water for the abbot's hands, and two hebdomadaries of the kitchen served with napkins. The chief servitor brought up to the president his food, allec or fish on a charger, and the inferior on his right hand carried mustard or other sauce. If a pittance was sent in by an obedientiary or lay person by the hall door, it was carried up the middle of the hall, but all other portions were carried along the side on the step before the tables. At dinner the cheese was carried up from the kitchen-window through the middle of the hall; but at supper along the side, and served after the president and guests, first to the high-mass priest and professed novices. Each servitor might carry three fercula, but not more than two before the seniors. Allec was served on Mondays, Tuesdays, and Thursdays in Lent. If any one made a noise with the cover of his cup, or spilt what was in it, he went to the step and prostrated, until the president struck the tablet, the sign for collecting the fragments, and then he rose and bowed; but if guests were present he was not to do this, but make satisfaction in chapter on the morrow. Nuts he was to open with his knife, but not crack them with his teeth, unless the whole convent was served with nuts. No one was to look across the hall, or to hand anything, or throw it to another table, but send it by the servitors. No one was to lean his chin on his hand, or cover his face with it, because these are attitudes of sorrow, pain, and excessive study. No one was to cross the hall directly, but to pass a little downwards, or along the lowest step of the high table, bowing to the Majesty in crossing. No one was to sit with his back bent, or with elbows or arms on the table; nor to talk or stare about and watch others, but to attend to the reader, and set his heart on his heavenly home. The two serving novices at high table before and after meals bowed, carried the sounding tablet to the prior for the Maundy, took off the abbot's boots at that ceremony, and carried tapers before him. They were not to turn their backs towards the convent; if their masters spilt ale or made a noise, they made the *venia* at the step. Two other servitors attended on the convent. Young novices, owing to their inexperience, were not to

serve for half a year after their profession ; but the younger priests were rather than they to collect the fragments. Novices not professed sat at the two last tables, and if there were none in that class, then the four last professed. Novices supped on the days when the convent did not. If the abbot sent a pittance to a monk, he rose and bowed ; if he sent it from his chamber, or the king, queen, or a bishop sent it, the president rose and bowed. When cheese was brought round, they simply bared their heads and cut it ; for formerly, until certain manors were assigned for furnishing it, the abbot found cheese only on principal feasts, in time of misericord, Advent, and Septuagesima. Formerly any one leaving hall before the convent had to pass under the tables ; but when the benches were made higher he passed between the wall and the backs of the brethren, and asked leave to go out at the step. At the end of hall time all by sign asked leave to go, saying, in silence, "*Confiteantur Tibi Domine,*" or "*Memoriam fecit.*" At the "*Gloria*" the senior priest said, "*Agimus Tibi gratias,*" or "*Benedictus Deus in donis suis,*" all the rest bowing. They then bowed ante et retro, and went down the hall to the place where the servitors stood, saying silently, "*Miserere mei Deus.*" They then halted, faced eastward, and the priest said, "*Et ut nos,*" and "*Retribuere dignare ;*" they then bowed again, and went out. If any had licence to drink whilst the servitors were dining, he went to the step, made the sign, and sat down at an upper table. No food was allowed but in hall, the misericord, the inner hostry, the infirmary, or at the abbot's or prior's table ; a monk might dine with a bishop or the sovereign, or any other great person, by permission. If coming through the city, on his return he might take refreshment. A monk when he ate was to be in his frock, except the abbot, the keeper of the misericord, the infirm, and the servers at the Maundy. The obedientiaries were not to eat or drink in their offices. After collation the monks might walk along the Thames bank, in the Chamberlain's garden, and the Almonry mead, but were to return at curfew. At the end of dinner, when the reader said "*Tu autem Domine,*" if there was to be supper, they covered their bread and salt ; but, if not, removed the cloth, and set their cups on the table. The kitchenier or subkitchenier, or some priest or deacon, presided at the dinner of the reader and servitors after the convent had dined. The priors of Hurley and Malvern were always given the lowest place among priors, and had only ordinary fare, because *professores nostri ordinis*. Juniors in custodia were not to serve or read in hall, but with the leave of the master of novices the subalmoner collected the fragments ; the subrefectorer attended to serving the food, and a brother was deputed to wait. The servitors had pulse, small pittances, and portions, and also a share in the great pittance. After hall they went into choir

in procession, saying "*Miserere mei Deus*," and if there was time, "*Laudate Dominum omnes gentes*," and "*Deus misereatur*." Three at least were to form a procession as for the Maundy, and to give extreme unction. The president had a *grossus panis* or a *flacon*, a *justata* of ale, a double portion of both courses, and the pittance. Of the two lesser pittances, for which sixpence a day was allowed, he had two, and the reader and each of the four servitors one portion; and two other pittances at the same cost were allotted by him for those who had been bled, or had returned from a journey or the infirmary. At the south end of the table was a dish laid there by the subalmoner, to be filled with the fragments of bread; and at the end of dinner, when the spoons had been collected, carried through the centre of the hall, a *latere sub gradu servitorum*, to the almonry. One of the servitor novices carried the other fragments to the almonry, at a blow given by the president. All were to drink, holding a cup with both hands; or if bled with one or two fingers on the side, as it was the custom of the English before the Normans came. The "*sanguinati*" sat by themselves. Every evening at dusk the subrefectorer lighted a lamp found by the sacrist inside the refectory-door; a second lamp, found by the refectorer, burned in the hall. On Michaelmas Day twenty-two, at other times eighteen or seventeen, tapers were lighted. These were set on the high table (*mensa capitalis*), three on each of the four chief tables, and two on the rest, and one at supper-time at the kitchen window, which Prior Philip rebuilt. Formerly there were a space and *circus claustralis*, with a vault between the refectory and kitchen, under which the servitors could escape the notice of the president, except the brethren on the abbot's side. Two candles were provided at the table of the bled, and eight candles were always to be ready for the misericord, that is, two at the window, one on the inner side and one towards the kitchen, and six more with three tapers on the table. After All Saints' Day, as long as there was daylight sufficient to allow books to be read in cloister, the cymbal was not to sound for the *potum caritatis*. After the *potum* the monks might sit in the chapter-house until collation. The sacristan found the light in the chapter-house, and in the intrinsic and regular parlour. The *potus* was allowed only on certain days. The refectorer at it rang his *skylla* once after the first sentence of the lection. The gospeller-deacon at high mass then went up, with seven monks from the bottom of the hall on each side, and received their cups, retiring to their seats when the refectorer filled them. Afterwards they again advanced at the sound of the refectorer's bell, and the deacon said "*Benedicite*." After the benediction the refectorer sounded, and the president rang his bell. When mead was drunk the pitanciar acted in place of the refectorer, who merely unlocked the door. After Compline

the prior gave three blows and curfew rang, and then the hall was shut for the night.

THE CLOISTERS.—At night, before matins and till their close, five cressets in lanterns were lighted at the four corners of the cloister, and before the dormitory door. Three other cressets in hanging lanterns burned, one in the north alley, in the middle, next the eastern church door; a second in the west alley, in the part assigned to the novices next the aumbry of their master; and the third in the south alley next the refectory. As soon as the rounds had been made after Compline, the subchamberlain extinguished them. The cloister was strewn with hay from All Saints to Easter, and at other times with rushes, as well as the two parlours by the almoner, and the infirmary chapel by the infirmarer. There was an annual procession round the whole abbey ambitum et procinctum totius abbacie, on the eve of S. Bartholomew. The abbot sat at the top of the east alley, the prior sat in the north wall next the church door, and the rest in order according to their seniority. The master of the novices sat first in the west alley, and then the novices and juniors in custodia, the youngest nearest to him. Each sat sidelong towards the back of the other, except when talking, as after chapter and before dinner, was allowed in the north alley, and then they still must sit and not stand. The keeper of the cloister-aumbry had his own seat. The prior, subprior, and master of novices had special charge of the cloisters, who might arrange the brethren at will. Abbot Berkyng, being baron of exchequer, first wore a cape in choir and cloister; but no abbot cerotegatus (gloved?) was to enter the chapter-house, but he might be so clad elsewhere. Feet-washing was not allowed in the south alley. On Good Friday one side of the whole cloister was strewn with hay or straw. Whenever the choir was strewn with straw, hay or rush, the cloister and both parlours were strewn with hay or straw. When the refectory was strewn with reeds or hay, the dormitory also, and the sala (hall,) and chambers in the infirmary were strewn. And soft hay daily from the almonry mead was put in the gongs (*necessariæ domus*), both of the dormitory and infirmary. Every winter the mats on the benches in cloister, refectory and the parlours were renewed by the almoner, together with the long large mat in the parlour for the bled to sit on. The refectorer provided mats in the misericord house adjoining the refectory. On Wednesdays and Fridays there were processions. The prior in summer-time made the sound, but on fast-days the sacristan or the subsacrist, to show the meridian was over; and then one or two bells were tolled at intervals, whilst the brethren washed their hands and combed their heads, and sat in order in cloister until the signal *ad sinaxim vespertinam*. At the lavatory (which the plumberar, or conductor, kept in or-

der at a stipend of half a mark,) by the refectory door hung five towels (*torsoria*), two used by the prior of cloister and the priest who sang high mass, and three on perches for the use of the convent, changed every Sunday by the chamberlain's servant, and the chamberlain was bound to have five pairs always ready. No one after dinner or supper might wash his hands, unless he sat some time in cloister, and then only the senior obedientiaries and the celebrant at high mass; juniors might also, if there was to be *potus caritatis*, when the convent in procession after supper went to the lavatory. Seniors in cowls might also wash their hands during the meridian in summer, and talk if in frocks. After foot-washing the monks washed their hands and knives at the lavatory. After Prime in winter, and at other hours, the convent left choir and sat in cloister, the *custodes ecclesiæ* alone excepted. No one could have leave to talk with another until after tierce out of cloister. Those who had leave to talk in cloister, or the parlour, were to do so sitting. The novices were taught to read and sing audibly, except at the Maundy, or in the space after dinner at certain times, after supper or the *potus*. Those who were to be bled stood outside the chapter door. Those who wrote did so apart under the eye of the *exploratores*, writing only for the advantage of the Church, or their souls' good. There were daily writers acting with leave of the superior. If a novice conversed with any brother, the master of the novices, or his *coadjutor*, sat between them. If the abbot passed all rose and bared their heads; if he took his seat, the master of the novices and the priests sat near him on benches, and the rest on the ground. French was used in conversation, in cloister and chapter, and Latin, to a prior or master of novices. At other times a book was not to be asked for under its title. In conversation time nails might be cut. No cellarer, infirmarer, or chamberlain, was allowed to have a carol. In them illumination, writing, and noting music was allowed. Prayer, meditation, "histories,"¹ and matters of divine service were to be the employment in cloister. When monks met in cloister the younger bowed to the senior, who returned the compliment; if the abbot passed they stood on one side. All bowed to the image of the Virgin before the chapter-house door. In cloister the frock was worn, as well as outside. The servants of the inner hostry, the doorkeeper of the cellarage, the servant of the outer parlour and the church servant, kept the cloister closed whilst the brethren shaved, washed their feet, or were in chapter, and specially took care in the king's absence that no layman in boots and spurs,² or

¹ The Histories in Cistercian statutes designate some of the Prophecies of Daniel and Ezekiel.

² The spur-money demanded in Henry the Seventh's chapel by the choristers may have been a relic of this custom.

barefooted, entered the refectory; honourable persons might be admitted during hall time, but no popularis was to be suffered to look in. No one, except an invited guest, was to use the lavatory towels. Formerly fortnightly in summer, and during three weeks in winter, the tonsure was given; but Abbot Berkyng allowed it to be made fortnightly throughout the year. The sub-chamberlain provided two tinæ (pans,) twenty-five patellæ (dishes,) soap and hot water, both for shaving and the feet-washing on Saturday night. The infirmarer, kitchener, chamberlain, almoner, and cellarers, and prior did not shave in cloister. The refectory and his colleague shaved at the door of the refectory, or cellarge. The rest shaved in gangs of three, shaving being a special branch of the training of novices. If there was a deep snow, or urgent need, shaving was permissible out of cloister. Those under perpetual silence shaved outside the chapter-house door. The shaving cloths were dried in the meadow after mass, and before the succeeding hour.

BLUNT'S VIEW OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY.

A Christian View of Christian History. By J. H. BLUNT. Rivingtons, 1866.

WHAT is history? and what are the qualities most necessary in an historian? are two questions to which it is by no means easy to find answers, and yet one can hardly form a clear estimate of any historical work without having some sort of idea on the subject. And we suppose that, speaking off-hand, most people would describe quite wrongly the character of history. For at first sight the province of the poet and the historian may seem not only distinct and separate the one from the other; but, further, it may even appear that the possession by an individual of the gift of imagination in any large degree would rather damage him as a writer of history than otherwise; that matter of fact, plain and unadorned, is what we want; and that he who can best give forth facts without any colour from his own mind is in the truest sense an historian. Now, without stopping to institute two inquiries important to the question, (1,) As to the possibility of any one writing that which he has not seen without possessing either Faith, or her twin-sister Imagination; and, (2,) As to whether any human being can relate facts without some colour,—we at once dissent from such a view. To accumulate mere facts is the work

of an annalist, because he is writing of the present ; great things are perchance being enacted around him, which are unknown to the agents themselves,

“ Which cannot all be known for years and years,
Uncomprehended as the shapes of hills,
When one stands in their midst.”

But an annalist stands pretty much in the same relation to an historian as a brickmaker does to an architect, or a grinder of colours to an artist. To a true historian belongs the power of grasping the spirit and bearing of an age, so as to discern its meaning ; of grouping events so as to evolve a scheme and system from the otherwise “ dry bones ” of ancient records ; of bringing us face to face, and mind to mind, with our kindred of past centuries ; and, finally, of tracing in all, and through all, the course of God's Kingdom of Providence.

And if, for the purposes of writing ordinary history, this philosophical and discerning mind is indispensable, how much more when the fortunes of CHRIST'S Body, the Church, are under review.

Mr. Blunt's book, which has given immediate occasion to our train of thought, is as peculiar in its scope as in its title, and we confess that we rise from a careful examination of its contents utterly unable to detect the principle of selection by which the author has been guided in its compilation. We feel inclined to apply to itself the description which it gives of the friars of the middle ages, viz., that it is “ neither fish nor fowl ”—neither Church history, nor historical essay, nor yet is it a dissertation like the *Five Empires* of Archdeacon Wilberforce, written to carry out a special theory or philosophy ; and so, while containing much that is valuable, it does not seem to supply any need in our Church literature.

It appears to profess to give a sketch of Church history from the birthday of the Christian Church to the mediæval ages, including the latter ; but we look in vain for so many critical facts and phases of Church practice and discipline that we hope Mr. Blunt only meant to afford a few sketches, without any idea of giving a systematic account of the period of which he treats. Indeed, charity would compel us to take this view ; for we observe that, while Mr. Blunt constantly apologises for the eccentricities of ancient and mediæval saints, assuring us again and again that in his own mind he is perfectly convinced of their good intentions, and only grieves that they did not know how to carry them into effect ; yet somehow he manages to suppress many of their practically good actions. His account of S. Simeon Stylites may show what we mean in saying this, and will also illustrate the complaint

we have to bring of flippancy, and an attempt at jocose and "popular" writing, which is particularly out of place in a Church historian.

"It requires a peculiar cast of mind," he says, "to recognise the reality of a piety which abstracted itself from all the duties and charities of life, never washed itself or changed its clothes, and made the whole duty of man to consist in standing on the top of a pillar, or in some other very unpractical, odd and comfortless position all the days of its life. Simeon Stylites originated the race of pillar hermits, his own surname being taken from *στυλος*, a pillar, about the beginning of the fourth century. He began his lifelong course of pillar devotion by standing for a few years on a column, the summit of which was only six cubits from the ground. The height was gradually increased, until he was in almost as elevated a position as the Duke of York, in S. James' Park; or Lord Nelson, in Trafalgar Square; or Lord Hill, at Shrewsbury; or Lord Gray, at Newcastle; or Lord Melville, at Edinburgh; and so he stood at one height and another for forty-seven years. One of his followers is said to have done the same for sixty-eight years, with this difference, that he stood on one leg instead of two. A jesting preacher would probably say that such religion had not two, nor one, but 'no leg' at all 'to stand on;' and though his opinion might differ from that of many good men, there can be little sympathising in the modern mind towards this gymnastic sect of Christians. All one can do is to hope they were good Christians in spite of themselves and their legs."—Pp. 265, 6.

Surely Mr. Blunt cannot present this to the public as Church history. If he means it for educated people it is simply an insult; and if for uneducated people it is little less than a fraud, and in either case it is low in tone. Who does not know of the thousands among the Arabs, Armenians, and Persians converted by the untiring labours of the man whom Mr. Blunt ridicules? and yet there is not one word of them. Indeed while speaking of conversions we may express our astonishment at the utter absence of any account of Missions which distinguishes this history of the Mediæval times from all other histories we have met with. If we had been asked, before reading this book, for the characteristic features of Mediæval Christianity, we fear we should have been ignorant enough to reply, (1) missionary enterprise and (2) scholastic theology. We should have cited as examples of the one Birinus, Wilfrith, Killian, Ruprecht, Willebrord, Boniface, Otto, and many more; and of the other the doctors whose names are as "household words," the Angelic, the Subtle, the Seraphic, the Irrefragable, &c. &c. But oddly enough, for anything of all this we look in vain. Certainly one mission, that of S. Augustine to Britain, is recorded, and the writer with his usual facetiousness calls it the first "Papal aggression;" but of the great missions to Central Europe we are told absolutely nothing.

However, we should be unjust if we were to withhold praise which is due to a large portion of Mr. Blunt's work. The early part is clear and lucid and is particularly valuable in identifying the Church of the Bible with that of later days, and in drawing its early records both of doctrine and discipline from the Acts of the Holy Apostles. It is precisely because we were so pleased with the early portions of the book that our disappointment in the latter part was great, and we strongly advise Mr. Blunt to revise it strictly and entirely. It gives one the impression of being written by two people, one of whom invariably apologises for the statements of the other; and (we are sorry to say it) we should shrink from placing the book as it now stands in the hands of any one not conversant with the facts of which it treats. It fails in catching the spirit of the Mediæval times and of Mediæval men; it stands aloof and looks on, and says that S. Francis was a "good man enough," and S. Dominic also, but does not think them at all wise; allows "with candour" that the writer of our Sacramental hymn, "Pange Lingua," knew something of the "spiritual application" of the Bible. This is not the way to write history, and we should prefer abuse to this chary praise.

We also strongly advise the re-writing of the paragraph, p. 152, on the Procession of the HOLY GHOST.

REVIEWS AND NOTICES.

Critical Notes on the Authorised English Version. By SAMUEL SHARPE. London: Smith.

IN these "Notes" we observe a still further approximation towards strict accuracy in translating the tenses of the Greek, and giving the proper force of the article. Still it is only an approximation which sometimes stops short in a most capricious and provoking manner of what criticism really demands. Thus, in Acts ii. 42, the author three times gives the definite article in the English, and once omits it; translating "the breaking of *the* bread and prayers," instead of "and *the* prayers." So as regards the force of the aorist in 1 Cor. v. 9, he rightly translates "I have written," instead of "I wrote;" but in a preceding verse the aorist is still rendered by the present "is slain." In the next chapter again, the important passage (1 Cor. vi. 11,) is translated as it should be, "Ye have washed yourselves, ye have been sanctified, ye have been justified." And this, it should be noticed, was the last lingering mistranslation of the aorist "justified." In 1 S. Peter i. 23, as in the first clause of 1 S. John v. 18, it might be supposed that a present sense was advisedly given to the perfect

participle, inasmuch as the action still continues (as the grammarians say,) in its results; but then again a present sense is given to the aorist participle also in the latter clause of the last-mentioned verse. This is plainly an inconsistency, for the correction of which we would refer Mr. Sharpe to a note in Mr. W. B. Marriott's "Eirenica," (p. 100.) In a former review we suggested some other alterations which he has not carried out, and it would be easy to point out many more. One, however, shall suffice which seems required on the plainest principle of criticism. In Acts xx. 32, Mr. Sharpe retains the rendering of the Authorised Version, "The word of His grace which is able to build you up;" but the antecedent to "which" is not "grace" but "Word," the personal *Λόγος*, and, therefore, it ought to be translated "Who" not "which."

We are glad to announce a new edition of Mr. SHIPLEY's *Church and the World*. (Longmans.) It is really matter of great congratulation when the "world" will inquire and read about the "Church," its constitution and its work, through some better medium than the "Times" and the "Pall Mall Gazette."

It is some time since we have met with a number of Mr. MICHELL's *Curate's Budget*. (Parker.) The new number, "An Old Score," is quite true to the habits of the agricultural poor; and we are glad to see that a double number is promised for Christmas.

Mr. BENSON's new work, *The Divine Rule of Prayer*, (Bell and Daldy, London,) is an important contribution to our list of devotional works. To those who have never attempted to study the boundless riches contained in our LORD's Divine Form of Prayer, it will open up a vast fund for meditation; while every line will be found suggestive of the practical holiness which must always coexist with true devotion. The work consists of a very instructive introductory essay and analysis of the Divine Prayer, with a number of beautiful paraphrases of it (original and selected,) which, apart from their obvious use, contain much sound teaching. We trust that Mr. Benson will work this subject out still further, for it is a grave reproach to the English Church that she has produced so few devotional treatises.

Mr. FREDERICK HELMORE has published *A very Easy Burial Service for Village Choirs*, (Masters,) which will be found useful in many quarters. Nothing is more popular than a choral funeral; and yet strange to say, there has not been one musical service in print that is fit for use by ordinary choirs. Marbecke's is dull and heavy; while those by Morley and Croft (which most strangely fail to give any music for "the anthem!") are not suited for any but cathedral choirs, and they require the organ throughout. We have ourselves for some years sung the sentences to the Third Gregorian Tone, and used MS. cadences for the other parts of the service. Mr. Helmore's cadences are pretty, and quite within the reach of any choir; but they have not the Gregorian character.

The Rev. W. LEA, the author of "*Catechizings on the Prayer Book*," has now published a small volume of *Sermons, (Masters,)* on the same book. They are nicely written; but though in advance of many publications, they do not contain quite so clear an exposition of doctrine as we could desire: the treatment of the Communion Service especially needs revision.

Mr. L. R. HAMILTON's *Parochial Sermons, (Masters,)* seem to have been chiefly published as "a Memorial of Eight Years' Ministry" at Bathwick. Dogma is not Mr. Hamilton's *forte*; but they are pleasantly written and affectionate.

Messrs. Rivingtons have published an edition of the Book of Common Prayer, in small octavo, with titles and borders designed by Holmes, and engraved on wood by Jewitt, of which we can speak favourably. Of course there is a monotony in a repetition of four borders, which, we believe, is the amount of variety. But there is a delicacy and sobriety in the ornamentation which render it pleasing to the eye.

With all respect to the Bishop of S. DAVID'S, we must confess ourselves unable to comprehend the devoting of his Charge to a long attack on ritual. In his diocese, he tells us, there are yet 200 benefices without glebe houses, and 120 parishes without schools. How many unrestored, and how many nearly empty churches there may be, is nowhere told us. In this state of things, there is no fear of too much ritualism being attempted; and surely some increase of it might be found advantageous. Ritualism, after all, is only training in the technicalities of the priest's office; and, if clergy really loved their work, they would certainly wish to do it better, and would not like to be so often mistaken, as they now are, for country gentlemen or farmers. There was reason why the bishop, three years ago, should have inveighed against Rationalism; for the then vice-principal of his Theological College, at Lampeter, was one of the prime movers in it. But if there may be some excess of ritual in two or three churches in England, we may apply the words of Hooker, and say, that "God has nowhere revealed that He desires to be worshipped beggarly" in South Wales.

We recommend a pamphlet, by Mr. GRUEBER, entitled, *The Mixed Chalice of the Blessed Sacrament*. (Rivingtons.) It is certainly impossible to suppose that the Reformers, who expressly desired that the Sacrament should be so done "as the early Fathers frequented it," can have meant to forbid this practice.

The *Monthly Paper of Sunday Teaching* (Mozleys) for the year includes readings on the latter books of the New Testament, questions on the Psalms, teachings on the Catechism, and other portions of the Prayer Book.

We can recommend *Sentences from the Offertory set to Music*, by B. H. WORTHAM, of Trinity College, Oxford (Novello.) They are chiefly composed in common chords, and so are well fitted for ordinary choirs.

Helpful Sam, (Parker) by the Author of "Tales of Crowbridge Workhouse," is a pretty tale of country life, which may be safely circulated. Boys will read it with avidity.

Mr. Macintosh is increasing his series of Tales for the Church seasons. Last year we had one on Christmas, and now we have to acknowledge, as supplementary to that, one on Advent, "Prepare ye the way of the LORD," and one for Epiphany, "A Light to lighten the Gentiles."

Local histories possess an interest, and do good far beyond the original circles for which they were intended. So we welcome and commend Mr. NORRIS's *Chronicle of the Church of S. Martin, at Leicester* (Bell and Daldy.) The bias of the writer is not what we could wish: but the documents, which belong to the Reformation period, are not without value.

A few Words as to the Reasons why all the Congregation ought to remain in Church until the End of the Service, whether they communicate or not, (Hayes,) is a thoroughly practical Tract, which looks at the question entirely from the common-sense point of view. We are glad to see that the Bishop of S. David's in his Charge does not hesitate to say, that "he should consider it a most unwarrantable encroachment on the right of conscience to compel any one to withdraw." And where the question of right is thus granted, surely individuals must consider for themselves, what tends most to edification and reverence.

God's Church on Earth, (Masters,) is a large subject to be treated of, however sketchily, in thirty-six pages. The Tract, however, is very interesting and full of instruction, whether or no we adopt the writer's theory of there being seven periods corresponding to the seven periods of the original Creation.

